

Spec  
HF  
1754  
.032  
1856

AUBURN UNIVERSITY  
LIBRARIES



Spec  
HF  
1754  
•C32  
1856

NON CIRCULATING


















Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2010 with funding from  
Lyrisis Members and Sloan Foundation

THE

# HARMONY OF INTERESTS,

AGRICULTURAL, MANUFACTURING,

AND

COMMERCIAL.

BY

HENRY C. CAREY,

AUTHOR OF "PRINCIPLES OF POLITICAL ECONOMY," "THE PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE,"  
ETC. ETC.

---

"Mr. CAREY, the well-known statistical writer of America, has supplied us with ample materials for conducting such an inquiry; and we can safely recommend his remarkable work to all who wish to investigate the causes of the progress and decline of industrial communities."—*Blackwood's Magazine*.

---

**Second Edition.**

NEW-YORK:  
MYRON FINCH, 122 NASSAU STREET..  
OFFICE OF THE PLOUGH, THE LOOM, AND THE ANVIL.  
1856.



---

ENTERED, ACCORDING TO ACT OF CONGRESS, IN THE YEAR 1852, BY  
MYRON FINCH,  
IN THE CLERK'S OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW-YORK.

---

AUBURN UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES  
AUBURN, ALABAMA 36830

Spec-  
H5  
17521  
FEB 14 '77  
DE

## P R E F A C E .

---

THE tendency of the whole British system of political economy is to the production of discord among men and nations. It is based upon the Ricardo and Malthusian doctrines of rent and population, which teach that men every where commence the work of cultivation on the rich soils of the earth, and that, when population is small, food is abundant; but that as numbers increase, men are forced to resort to poorer soils, yielding steadily less and less in return to labor. As a necessary consequence of the increasing scarcity of fertile soils, it is held that with this diminishing return, the land-holder is enabled to take a larger proportion of the proceeds of labor, thus profiting at the cost of the laborer, and by reason of the same causes which tend to the gradual subjugation of the latter to the will of his master. Here are, of course, lying at the very foundation of the system, discordant interests, and this discord is found in every succeeding portion of it. Over-population is held to be a result of a great law of nature, in virtue of which men grow in numbers faster than can grow the food that is to nourish them; and the poverty, vice, and crime that everywhere exist, are regarded as necessary consequences of this great law, emanating from an all-wise, all-powerful, and all merciful Being. War, famine, and pestilence are regarded as means provided by that Being for restraining population within the limits of subsistence. Charity is regarded as almost a crime, because it tends to promote the growth of population. The landlord excuses himself for taking large rents, on the ground that it is a necessary consequence of the natural tendency of man to increase in numbers with too great rapidity. The stockholder of the East India Company, who luxuriates upon the produce of his stock, regards it as one of the natural consequences of this great law that he should receive, as rent, so large a portion of the proceeds of labor applied to cultivation, as to leave to the poor cultivator but half a dollar per month, out of which to supply himself and his family with food, raiment, and shelter; and excuses himself to his conscience, on the ground that it is a necessary result of great natural laws. Capital cannot become more productive, except at the cost of labor; nor can wages rise, except at the cost of capital.

Among the consequences of this great law of discords, promulgated by Malthus and Ricardo, is found the idea that, if men would prosper, they must live apart from each other. The rich lands of England are, as it is said, already occupied, and those who would find rich lands must fly to America or to Australia, there to produce food and raw materials with which to supply the market of England; and thus it is that that country seeks to establish a system of commercial centralization, that is—as was so justly said, seventy years since, by *Adam Smith*—a manifest violation of “the most sacred rights of mankind.” That great man was fully possessed of the fact that, if the farmer or planter would flourish, he must bring the consumer to his side; and that if the artisan would

flourish, he must seek to locate himself in the place where the raw materials were grown, and aid the farmer by converting them into the forms fitting them for the use of men, and thus facilitating their transportation to distant lands. He saw well, that when men came thus together, there arose a general harmony of interests, each profiting his neighbor, and profiting by that neighbor's success, whereas the tendency of commercial centralization was toward poverty and discord, abroad and at home. The object of protection among ourselves is that of aiding the farmers in the effort to bring consumers to their sides, and thus to carry into effect the system advocated by the great author of *The Wealth of Nations*, while aiding in the annihilation of a system that has ruined Ireland, India, Portugal, Turkey, and all other countries subject to it; and the object of the following chapters is that of showing why it is that protection is needed; how it operates in promoting the prosperity of, and harmony among, the various portions of society; and how certain it is that THE TRUE, THE PROFITABLE, AND THE ONLY MEANS OF ATTAINING PERFECT FREEDOM OF TRADE, is to be found in that efficient protection which shall fully and completely carry out the doctrine of Dr. Smith, in bringing the loom and the anvil to take their natural places by the side of the plough and the harrow.

# INDEX.

- ADVANTAGE** of bringing machinery to the cotton, *page* 145.
- African cotton**, attempts to raise, 174.
- Agricultural labour in England**, 155.
- Americans responsible for the wars of England**, 197.
- BALTIMORE** and Ohio railroad tolls, 24.  
..... and Ohio railroad tolls, diagram of, 35.
- Brazil**, supply of cotton from, 170.
- British commerce ruinous to Ireland and India**, 71.  
..... efforts to underwork all other nations, 54.  
..... imports and exports, 56.  
..... legislation upon imports and exports, 53.  
..... slave history disgraceful, 169.  
..... system and protection contrasted, 72.  
..... causes poverty in the producer, 101.  
..... endeavours to maintain monopoly of machinery, 101.
- Bullion and specie** should be included in Tariff tables, 7.
- CANADA** and Cuba, objections to their annexation, 62.  
..... form of its commerce, 99.  
..... ruined by free trade, 99.
- Canadian desire for annexation**, 62.  
..... desire for annexation, its cause, 99.  
..... exports, 91.  
..... independence would stop immigration in the United States, 73.  
..... produce sent to England, 22.
- Capital and labour wasted in transportation**, 146.  
..... who suffers by its waste, 192.
- Capitalist**, how affected by protection, 141.  
..... small, ruined by fluctuations occasioned by the British system, 199.
- Cheap labour**, 130.
- China**, manufacture of, 26.
- Chinese system of trade**, 134.
- Clothing**, power to obtain, in exchange for labour, 16, 40.  
..... power to obtain, increases under protection, 16.  
..... price of, is really very high, 111.
- Coal**, consumption of, 13, 33.  
..... rate of its consumption under the Tariff of 1828, 85.  
..... price of, reduced with increased production, 14.  
..... production and consumption of, increase and diminish together, 14.
- Coffee**, consumption of, 28, 33.  
..... abolition of duties on, 30.
- Colonial system** presents combination of action, 95.  
..... system depresses the price of cotton, 99.  
..... manufactures, object of prohibiting, 131.
- Colonies of England**, their consumption of cotton, 110.
- Colonization**, British system of, 64.
- Combination** diminished by emigration, 94.  
..... impossible in a state of poverty, 87.  
..... increases population, 88.  
..... increases value of labour, 86.  
..... needed in this country, 52.  
..... of labour, strikes, &c., 161.
- Commercial policy**, review of our, 10.
- Commerce** decreases under free trade, 73.  
..... definition of, 67.  
..... increases under protection, 72.  
..... internal, 23.  
..... power to maintain external, 39.  
..... power to maintain internal, 39.  
..... tends to produce equality of condition, 153.
- Communism** among nations produced by policy of England, 154.
- Compromise Act**, 3.  
..... its operation, 5.
- Concentration** needed to make labour productive, 89.
- Condition of English people**, 154.  
..... of man improved by increase of productive power, 78.
- Consumer** should live near the farmer, 96.
- Consumption** equals production, 45.  
..... grows with power of production, 23.  
..... of foreign products decreases under free trade, 42.  
..... not arrested by high prices, 116.  
..... power of, decreases as the producers are more and more distant from market, 87.
- Conversion and exchange**, doctrine of, 46.  
..... how maintained in England, 63.  
..... increases man's necessities, and diminishes his powers, 193.  
..... tends to destroy labour and capital, 150.
- Cotton**, comparative consumption of, under protection and free trade, 110, 114.  
..... comparative prices of crop and cotton goods in Liverpool, from 1843 to 1847, 137.  
..... decrease in its cultivation, 103.  
..... decrease in its price, 114.  
..... diagram of imports of foreign, 36.

- Cotton, does not increase in supply for want of a market, 121.  
 ..... fluctuations in price of, 116.  
 ..... production of the world, 59.  
 ..... Prussian imports of, before the Zollverein, 107.  
 ..... return for, consumed in England, 58.  
 ..... statement of crop and consumption of American, 106.  
 ..... speculation in India a failure, 111.  
 ..... supply of, to Britain falling off, 179.  
 ..... trade between the United States and England, 114.  
 ..... weekly consumption of, in Great Britain, 175.  
 ..... where the best is raised, 105.  
 ..... goods, 110.  
 ..... goods and yarn exported to India from England, 103.  
 ..... and twist, prices from 1844 to 1848, 117.  
 ..... consumption of, 15, 33.  
 ..... consumption of, under free trade, and under protection, 16.  
 ..... dearest when cotton is lowest, 117.  
 ..... import of, 15.  
 ..... imported into Canada from England, 99.  
 Credit, public, 31, 39.  
 Cultivator, his gradual operations with the land, 123.  
 Currency, how affected by protection, 135.  
 DEBT created by importations, 26.  
 ..... foreign, 37.  
 ..... public, 31, 38.  
 Dependence on England a cause of non-consumption of iron, 83.  
 Depopulation, present tendency to, 20.  
 ..... diagram of, 34.  
 Disasters of 1836 to 1842, how produced, 188.  
 ..... present tendency to, 189.  
 Duties of the United States, 227.  
 Duty affects amount of importation slightly, 26.  
 EARTH, a machine to be fashioned to man's purposes, 123.  
 ..... the only producer, 124.  
 Earthenware manufacture, 26.  
 East Indies, British supply of cotton from, 176.  
 Effects of putting a factory or furnace in operation, 43.  
 ..... of establishing manufactures in the South, 50.  
 Egypt, British supply of cotton from, 170.  
 Emigration from cotton states, 121.  
 ..... from Eastern states, 87.  
 ..... should be stopped, 121.  
 ..... westward, 20, 87.  
 England in distress by reason of the disproportion of consumers to producers, 65.  
 ..... condition of inhabitants of, 109, 154.  
 ..... fixes the price of products of the farmer, 141.  
 ..... real wealth of, 63.  
 ..... result of dependence on, 60.  
 English colonies continually want annexation, 113.  
 ..... consumers and producers, 95.  
 ..... consumption of cotton, 107.  
 ..... consumption of cotton cloth, 117.  
 English free trade disastrous to other nations, 132.  
 ..... market for our cotton does not grow with its production, 180.  
 ..... school, its doctrines, 29.  
 ..... teaching of its opponents, 30.  
 Exchanges, how affected by protection, 198.  
 Exchangers, influence on pauperism, 81.  
 ..... producers make sacrifices to the, 101.  
 Expenditure, public, 30, 38.  
 Exportation of food, 81, 92.  
 Exports, value of, 36.  
 FARMER can get most clothing for his produce when the power of producing cloth is greatest, 21.  
 ..... exhausted by free trade, 73.  
 ..... how he may get the highest prices in foreign markets, 98.  
 ..... profit by emigration only under protection, 98.  
 ..... sells in the cheapest market, and buys in the dearest, 81.  
 ..... suffers by non-production of iron, 80.  
 Flax, manufacture of, 26, 37.  
 Flour consumed in English cotton factories, 111.  
 Food, product, export, and import of, 21.  
 ..... power to obtain in exchange for labour, 40.  
 ..... why supply of, increases faster than the demand, 97.  
 ..... why scarce in England, 57.  
 Freedom of man increases with wealth and population, 162.  
 Free trade among states, 3.  
 ..... approach to, creates debt, 23.  
 ..... approach to, is progress downward, 160.  
 ..... based on cheap labour, 130.  
 ..... doctrines about rights of man, 128.  
 ..... impoverishes the masses, 74.  
 ..... real, beneficial to all, 135.  
 ..... results, if introduced in the United States, 132.  
 Freights should be included in valuation of exports, 8.  
 French consumption of cotton, 122.  
 ..... productions, 139.  
 ..... productions imported into the United States, 27, 37.  
 Friendship unknown in trade, 205.  
 Fuel necessary to obtain iron, 78.  
 GIBRALTAR, its use, 112.  
 God and silver contribute little to man's necessities, 124.  
 Government, how affected by protection, 221.  
 Grain dearer in coal regions than in Philadelphia, 98.  
 ..... price of, would increase under protection, 98.  
 ..... production of, 21, 35.  
 HARMONY of interests, 41.  
 ..... perfect throughout the whole union, 117.  
 ..... between planter, manufacturer, and ship-owner, 119.  
 ..... between land-owners and labourers of the world, 131.  
 Home markets make highest prices, 16.  
 IMMIGRATION affected slowly by change in Tariff, 19.



- Immigration decreases under free trade, 28.**  
 ..... diagram of, 34.  
 ..... diminishing at present, 20.  
 ..... effect on consumption, 130.  
 ..... effect on price of wheat, 96.  
 ..... should be encouraged, 121.  
 ..... stops with decreased combination of action, 94.  
 ..... results of, had it continued at the same rate as in 1834, 115.  
 ..... table of, 17.  
 ..... would raise price of man abroad, 116.  
**Importation diminishes under free trade, 28.**  
 ..... means of, 90.  
 ..... of men and merchandise, 90.  
 ..... of men reduces shipping prices, 93.  
 ..... of labour and iron, 81.  
 ..... under different tariffs, 9.  
**Independence of England, advantages of, 97.**  
**India, commerce of, 103.**  
 ..... attempts to raise cotton in, 103, 117, 133.  
 ..... commerce of, 103.  
 ..... cotton exported from, to England, 104.  
 ..... ruined by dependence on England, 61, 103.  
**Individual credit, how affected by protection, 213.**  
**Intellectual condition of man, how affected by protection, 209.**  
**Internal commerce, 23.**  
**Ireland, exports of, 91.**  
 ..... importation of cotton into, 109.  
 ..... ruined by dependence on England, 61, 103.  
**Iron, abounding in America, 78.**  
 ..... associated with production, 125.  
 ..... chief constituent of machinery, 78.  
 ..... consumption of, 12, 32, 79.  
 ..... cost of, in labour, 12.  
 ..... domestic production of, 11.  
 ..... fluctuation in price of, 82.  
 ..... foundation of civilization, 78.  
 ..... non-production of, injures the producer of food, 80.  
 ..... power of importing, greatest under protection, 13.  
 ..... production of, quadrupled by protection, 83.  
 ..... quantity of, imported since 1821, 10, 11.  
**LABOUR and capital wasted in transportation, 149.**  
 ..... best rewarded under protection, 28.  
 ..... gives value to land, 124.  
 ..... has smallest return where machinery of transportation is most needed, 153.  
 ..... power of, to obtain food, clothing, and the aid of machinery, 40.  
 ..... saved in New England, 48.  
 ..... tends to produce equality of condition, 155.  
 ..... wasted in the Southern states, 49.  
**Labourer, how affected by protection, 151.**  
**Labourers' common interest, 130.**  
**Lake tonnage, 24, 36.**  
**Land, a great saving fund, acquiring value from labour, 122.**  
 ..... effect of sales of, on immigration, 20.  
 ..... more valuable in the United States than in Canada, 129.  
**Land, public, 220.**  
 ..... quantity of, sold, 20.  
 ..... value of, depends on cost of transportation, 127.  
**Land-owners in England, 129.**  
 ..... in India, Ireland, &c., 129.  
 ..... in Parliament, 132.  
 ..... remedy for their grievances, 130.  
**Lead, consumption of, 31.**  
 ..... production of, 18.  
**Linen, importation of, 27.**  
**Louisville and Portland canal, trade on, 35.**  
**MACHINERY, increased facility of procuring, causes increased production of food, 21.**  
 ..... must be brought to the cotton, 144.  
 ..... object of, 78.  
 ..... of three kinds, 151.  
 ..... power to obtain in aid of labour, 40.  
 ..... required to render labour productive, 151.  
**Man the most valuable commodity, 94.**  
**Manufacture of small articles in the West, 51.**  
**Manufacturer's true interest, 136.**  
**Markets, the best for products are those made at home, 45, 139.**  
 ..... wanted for producers, 122.  
**Marriage regarded as a luxury in Europe, 128.**  
**Merchants are agents of the producers, 80.**  
 ..... get the benefit of the producer's toil, 81.  
**Mission, true, of the United States, 227.**  
**Monopoly of machinery cause of the planter's poverty, 76.**  
 ..... of machinery, effects of abolishing the, 136.  
**Morality, how affected by protection, 202.**  
**NATION, how affected by protection, 223.**  
**National credit, how affected by protection, 218.**  
**Necessity for producers and consumers to live near each other, 96.**  
**New England, wages in, will rise when they increase in the South and West, 153.**  
**New Orleans, trade of, 25.**  
 ..... diagram of produce received at, 36.  
**New York canal tolls, 24, 35.**  
 ..... diagram of houses built in, 36.  
 ..... growth of, 25.  
**Non-production of iron injures the producer of food, 80.**  
**ORE and fuel in Ohio and the West, 78.**  
**Over-population, general pretext for the evils of a vicious system, 55.**  
 ..... wrongly complained of in Europe, 129.  
**Over-production and under-consumption, 103.**  
**PAUPERISM increases in free-trade countries, 128.**  
 ..... results from the English colonial system, 195.  
**Pennsylvania canal tolls, 24, 35.**  
**Philadelphia, growth of, 25.**  
**Philadelphia, ratio of growth of, to the population of the Union, 36.**  
**Planters' advantages, if possessing their own machinery, 143.**  
 ..... advantage to, arising from the annexation of Canada, 99.

- Planters benefited by consumption of cotton at home, 116.  
 ..... impoverished by the speculations of exchangers, 76.  
 ..... need machinery to convert their own crops, 138.  
 ..... oppose their own interests, 169.  
 ..... tobacco and cotton, relative returns for their products, 119.  
 ..... true policy to break down English monopoly of machinery, and bring English machinery to the cotton field, 185.  
 ..... why they receive small returns for their capital, 143.
- Population, diagram of, 33.  
 ..... of Philadelphia, 36.
- Portugal, causes of its poverty, 112.
- Powers of man increase as his necessities diminish, 192.
- Prices highest when a nation buys and sells at home, 14.
- Producer's returns in cotton cloth, 112.
- Production of food and iron unequal, 70.  
 ..... relation of, to commerce, 68.
- Productive power, diminution of, brings discord and internal disorder, 194.
- Proportion of producers to consumers in England, 55.
- Protection, how it affects morals, 202.  
 ..... public credit, 217.  
 ..... revenue and expenditure, 42, 219.  
 ..... the capitalist, 141.  
 ..... consumption of cotton, 108.  
 ..... currency, 185.  
 ..... exchanges, 198.  
 ..... friends of peace, 193.  
 ..... government, 221.  
 ..... growth of new states, 88.  
 ..... intellectual condition, 209.  
 ..... nation, 223.  
 ..... political condition, 213.  
 ..... power to import, 42.  
 ..... price of cotton, 114.  
 ..... slave and his master, 161.  
 ..... value of labour, 66.  
 ..... woman, 200.  
 ..... increases immigration and the number of consumers, 98.  
 ..... raises the value of man, 130.  
 ..... raises the value of land, 133.  
 ..... reduces prices, and increases the power of consumption, 41.  
 ..... saves cost of transportation, 141.  
 ..... why required, 51.
- Public credit, 31, 38.  
 ..... debt, 31, 32.  
 ..... expenditure, 30, 38.
- RAILROADS do not lessen the number of horses, 127.  
 ..... increase production, 127.
- Return freights, 93.
- Returns for products, 43.
- Revenue from customs, diagram, 38.  
 ..... from imports, 28.  
 ..... decreases under free trade, 28.  
 ..... how affected by different tariffs, 29.  
 ..... how affected by protection, 219.
- Road from the Mississippi to the Pacific, 90.  
 ..... to be productive, must go through rich countries, 89.
- Rothschild, his system of accumulating wealth, 75.
- Russia wastes food for want of a market, 131.
- Russian exports, 91.  
 ..... system of commerce, 91.
- SAVING-FUNDS found in mills furnaces, and coal mines, 46.
- Settlers' life and experience, 126.
- Silver and gold contribute little to man's necessities, 191.
- Ship-owner's true interest, 136.
- Shipping affected slowly by changes in tariff, 19.  
 ..... built to replace vessels sent to California, 19.  
 ..... built, tables of, 19, 34.  
 ..... increases with protection, 90.
- Slavery agitation, how best ended, 165.  
 ..... would be abolished by making a market on the land in the South, 164.
- Slave-history of England disgraceful to that nation, 169.
- Slaves have been well kept in the United States, 169.
- ..... Northern men cannot afford to raise, 163.
- Smuggling as regarded by British authorities, 112.
- Soils, poorest, first cultivated, 29.
- South Carolina, her inability to produce cotton in competition with her neighbours, 166.
- Specie and bullion should be included in Tariff tables, 7.  
 ..... imported and exported, 1829 to 1849, 9.
- Steamboat tonnage, 24, 34.
- Sugar, production, importation, and consumption of, 23, 35, 120.  
 ..... returns for, 120.
- Swords and muskets hinder returns to labour, 193.
- TARIFFS, outline history of, 3.  
 ..... merits of, require time for development, 6.  
 ..... principal features of that of 1816, 5.  
 ..... 1824, 5.  
 ..... 1828, 5.  
 ..... 1832, 5.  
 ..... 1833, 5.  
 ..... 1842, 5.  
 ..... 1846, 5.  
 ..... of 1846, effects of maintaining it, 67.  
 ..... 1828, effects that would have resulted from its continuance, 115.
- Taxation of the sugar planter, 76.  
 ..... increased by pauperism, 76.
- Tea, abolition of duty on, 30.  
 ..... consumption of, 28, 37.
- Tendency to produce only the finest cotton fabrics in England, 179.
- Tolls on internal commerce, 24, 35.
- Tonnage, increase and diminution of, 19.  
 ..... lake, 24, 36.  
 ..... steamboat 24, 36.
- Tobacco, consumption of, 119.
- Tobacco trade, 118.
- Trade of New Orleans, 24.  
 ..... New York, 25.  
 ..... Philadelphia, 25.



- Trading with a poor people tends to reduce our wages to a level with theirs, 77.
- Transportation, costs of, reduce the value of land, 127.
- ..... capital employed in, 143.
- UNITED STATES, British supply of cotton from the, 171.
- ..... exports of cotton from, to England, 106.
- ..... exports of grain from, to England, 95.
- ..... importation of men into the, 92.
- ..... present policy of the, 134.
- ..... receipts of cloth and iron from England, 113.
- ..... true mission of the, 227.
- ..... wealth of, in land, coal, and metals, 128.
- Union between producers and consumers most profitable when made at home, 51.
- VALUE of exports, 25.
- ..... of imports, 10.
- Variations in prices caused by dependence on England, 83.
- WAGES, fall under free trade, 28.
- ..... of labourers in England, 93.
- ..... of labourers in Ireland, 94.
- ..... process of reducing, 75.
- War, causes of recent, 193.
- ..... on the labour and capital of the world prepared in England, 95.
- ..... on what the power to make it depends, 194.
- Wars of England, Americans responsible for the, 197.
- Western steamboat tonnage, 36.
- Woman, how protection affects, 200.
- Wool trade, 102.
- Woollens, consumption of, 33.
- ..... importations of, 16, 37.
- ZOLLVEREIN, cotton trade flourishing under its auspices, 107.
- ..... imports into Prussia before and after its formation, 107.



THE

## HARMONY OF INTERESTS:

AGRICULTURAL, MANUFACTURING, AND COMMERCIAL.

---

WHY is protection needed? Why cannot trade with foreign nations be carried on without the intervention of custom-house officers? Why is it that that intervention should be needed to enable the loom and the anvil to take their natural places by the side of the plough and the harrow? Such are the questions which have long occupied my mind, and to the consideration of which I now invite my readers.

Of the advantage of perfect freedom of trade, theoretically considered, there could be no doubt. The benefit derived from such freedom in the intercourse of the several States, was obvious to all; and it would certainly seem that the same system so extended as to include the commerce with the various states and kingdoms of the world could not fail to be attended with similar results. Nevertheless, every attempt at so doing had failed. The low duties on most articles of merchandise in the period between 1816 and 1827, had produced a state of things which induced the establishment of the first really protective tariff, that of 1828. The approach to almost perfect freedom of trade in 1840, produced a political revolution, and a similar but more moderate measure, led to the revolution of last year. These were curious facts, and such as were deserving of careful examination.

It may be assumed as an universal truth, that every step made in the right direction will be attended with results so beneficial as to pave the way for further steps in the same direction, and that every one made in the wrong direction will be attended with disadvantageous results tending to produce a necessity for a retrograde movement. The compromise bill, in its final stages, was a near approach to perfect freedom of trade, the highest duty being only 20 per cent. Believing it to be a step in the right direction, one of the enthusiastic advocates of perfect freedom of trade proposed, soon after its passage, that, commencing with 1842, there should be a further reduction of one per cent. per annum for twenty years, at the end of which time all necessity for custom-houses would have disappeared. With the gradual operation of the earlier stages of that bill there was, however, produced a state of depression so extraordinary as to lead to a political change before reaching its final stages,

and the duties had scarcely touched the point of 20 per cent. before they were raised to 30, 50, 60, or more, by the passage of the tariff of 1842. With the election of 1844, the friends of free trade were restored to power, and two years afterwards was passed the tariff of 1846—the free-trade measure—in which the revenue duty on articles to be protected was fixed at *thirty* per cent. Here was a retrograde movement. Instead of passing from twenty downwards, we went up to thirty, and thus was furnished an admission that so near an approach to free trade with foreign nations as was to be found in twenty per cent. duties had not answered in practice. Since then, it has been admitted, even by the most decided free-trade advocates, that on certain commodities even thirty per cent. was too low, and within six months from the date of the passage of the act of 1846, its author proposed to increase a variety of articles to thirty-five and forty per cent.\* Here was another retrograde movement. It is now admitted that there are other articles the duties on which require to be raised, and daily experience goes to prove that such must be the case, or we must abandon some of the most important branches of industry. The tendency is, therefore, altogether backward. Thirty per cent. duty is now regarded as almost perfect freedom of trade, and instead of proposing a further annual reduction, each year produces a stronger disposition for a considerable increase. In all this, it is impossible to avoid seeing that there is great error somewhere, and almost equally impossible to avoid feeling a desire to understand why it is that the approaches towards freedom of trade with foreign nations have so frequently failed, and why it is that every strictly revenue tariff is higher than that which preceded it.

With a view to satisfy myself in regard thereto, I have recently made the examination, before referred to, of our commercial policy during the last twenty-eight years, commencing with 1821, being the earliest in relation to which detailed statements have been published. Before commencing to lay before you the results obtained, it may be well to say a few words as to the merits claimed by the two parties for their respective systems.

The one party insists that protection is “a war upon labour and capital,” and that by compelling the application of both to pursuits that would otherwise be unproductive, the amount of necessaries, comforts, and conveniences of life obtainable by the labourer is diminished. The other insists that by protecting the labourer from competition with the ill-fed and worse-clothed workmen of Europe, the reward of labour will be increased. Each has thus his theory, and each is accustomed to furnish facts to prove its truth, and both can do so while limiting themselves to short periods of time, taking at some times years of small crops, and at others those of large ones, and thus it is that the inquirer after truth is embarrassed.† No one has yet, to my knowledge, ever undertaken to examine all the facts during any long period of time, with a view to show what have been, under the various systems, the powers of the labourer to command the necessaries and comforts of life. One or other of the systems is true, and that is true under which labour is most largely rewarded: that under which the labourer is enabled to consume most largely of food, fuel, clothing, and all other of those good things for the attainment of which men are willing to labour. If, then, we can ascertain the power of consumption at various periods, and the result be to show that it has invariably increased under one course of action, and as invariably diminished under another, it will be equivalent to a demonstration of the

\* Treasury Report, Feb. 1, 1847.

† A person employed in the preparation of government statistics inquired, on being asked to prepare some tables, what was to be the policy to be proved. “Why,” said the other, “could you prove both sides?” “Equally well,” said he.



truth of the one and the falsehood of the other. To accomplish this, has been the object of the inquiry in which I have recently been engaged.

It is necessary now to show what have been the distinguishing features of the several systems that have been in operation during the period to be examined. They are as follows:—

First. The tariff of 1816 was a planters' and farmers' measure. Cotton and coarse cotton cloths were carefully protected. Iron itself was well protected, but almost all manufactures of iron, the commodities for the production of which pig or bar iron could be used, were admitted at 20 per cent. Wool paid 15 per cent. Blankets and woollen and stuff goods paid 15 per cent., and finer goods 25 per cent., until 1819, after which they paid but 20 per cent. Spirits paid a heavy specific duty, for the benefit of the farmers; but paper, hats, caps, manufactures of leather, types, and manufactured articles generally, paid only from 20 to 30 per cent. Coal paid 5 cents per bushel, but the commodities in the manufacture of which coal was to be used paid ad valorem duties. Protection was thus given to the coarse commodities that least required it, and refused to those for the production of which the coarser ones were to be used. As a matter of course, its protective features were totally inoperative.

Second. That of 1824, under which iron was, as before, well protected, but manufactures of iron, and of metals generally, were admitted at 25 per cent. Wool was raised to 20 per cent., to increase, by successive stages, until it reached 30 per cent. Coarse woollens were fixed permanently at 25 per cent. Finer ones were to rise gradually until they reached 33½ per cent. Carpets paid from 20 to 50 cents per square yard. Hams paid 3, and butter 5 cents per pound. Potatoes 10, oats 10, and wheat 25 cents per bushel; while scythes, spades, shovels, and other things requisite for the raising of wheat and potatoes, paid 30 per cent. Spirits were carefully protected. Bolting cloths paid 15 per cent. Sail-duck, Osnaburgs, &c., 15 per cent. Cotton cloths paid 25 per cent., with a minimum of 30 cents per yard. The general features of this law did not vary materially from those of that of 1816, although protection was slightly increased.

Third. The first tariff thoroughly protective, and so intended to be, was that of 1828. It continued until 1832, when was passed the first of two laws by which the whole policy of the country was changed. This series constitutes stage the

Fourth. By the act of July 14, 1832, railroad iron was admitted free of duty. Axes, spades, &c., as before, 30 per cent. Bar and pig iron were carefully protected, but a large portion of the commodities for which they were needed were thus admitted without duty, or at the same rate as under our present free-trade tariff. Tea and coffee were free. Silks paid 10 per cent. Wool was protected, but worsted stuff goods were admitted at 10 per cent. Cotton goods paid 25 per cent., with minimums of 30 cents for plain, and 35 for prints. This continued in force until the following March, when was passed the *Compromise Act*, under which linens, stuff goods, silks, and other articles were admitted free of duty, and one-tenth of the excess over 20 per cent. reduced from all other commodities, to take effect December, 1833, with a further similar reduction every two years until 1841, when one-half of the remaining surplus was to be reduced, and the other half in 1842, when no duty would exceed 20 per cent.

Fifth. The protective tariff of 1842, which was followed by

Sixth. The free trade tariff of 1846, now in existence.

We have thus had six different systems, but the first and second differ from each other so little that it is unnecessary to separate the years falling under them, whereas the early years of the *Compromise* differ so essentially

from the two latter that it is expedient to separate them. I shall therefore group the results as follows:—

First. The tariffs of 1816 and 1824, ending with 1829.

Second. That of 1828, commencing with October, 1829, and ending with the period at which the Compromise began to become operative, October, 1834.

Third. The Compromise, commencing with 1835 and ending with 1841.

Fourth. The years 1842 and 1843, the period immediately preceding and following the passage of the act of 1842, being that of the strictly revenue tariff of 20 per cent.

Fifth. The tariff of 1842, commencing June, 1843, and ending June, 1847.

Sixth. That of 1846, commencing June, 1847, and coming down to the present time.

It will be observed that I have placed the year 1829 in the first period, and 1834 in the second. It is not the passage of an act that produces change, but its practical operation, and the first year of the existence of a new system is but the sequel of that which is passing out. When protection is given to the makers of cloth and iron, mills and furnaces are not built in a day, nor are they abandoned as soon as protection is withdrawn. Had it been possible, I would have pursued the same precise system with every period, but it was not. The act of 1842 came into operation on the first of September of that year, and in the following one the time for making up the Treasury accounts was changed to June 30, and therefore only the first ten months that followed its going into effect could be included under the previous period. That of 1846 did not come into effect until December 1, and therefore but the first seven months that followed could be included in the system of 1842. The law of 1842 was in existence four years and a quarter, but I could give it only four years, which works materially to its disadvantage, and to the advantage of that of 1846.

In some cases even more than a year would be required to make an exact comparison of the working of the different systems. The immigration of one year is materially influenced, perhaps I might say determined, by the state of the labour-market of the previous year, and the change in that is at least a year subsequent to the passage of a law. Thus, if the tariff of 1842 tended to raise the compensation of the labourer, its effects would not become obvious until 1843, and it would not be until 1844 or even 1845, that an increase of immigration would take place. The price of labour was high in 1847–8, and we have a large amount of immigration in 1849. It is now falling, and the immigration of next year will probably be reduced.

So likewise is it with the supply of grain. A diminution in the demand for labour in mines and furnaces in 1842 tended to increase emigration to the West. For the first year, 1843, those emigrants were consumers only. In the second, 1844, they had grain to sell, and prices fell. In the present year, the demand for labour in mines and furnaces, and in the erection of mills and furnaces, is diminished, and emigration to the West is increased, yet the effect of this on the supply and price of food may not, and probably will not become obvious until 1852.

Your predecessor appears entirely to have overlooked this necessity for allowing time to permit new systems to develop themselves, and to affect the movements of the people. In his last report to Congress is given a comparative view of the receipts from customs in the last six months of the tariff of 1842, and the first six of that of 1846, by which it is shown that the one was twice as productive as the other, and yet very slight reflection would have sufficed to satisfy him that scarcely any portion of the difference

had resulted from the change of commercial policy indicated by the adoption of his tariff. The amount that could be imported and paid for was dependent on the state of affairs that had existed in the country during the previous year, and the passage of the law had scarcely even the slightest influence upon it. In the same way, the receipts from customs from September, 1842, to November, 1846, are compared with those of 1847 and 1848, when it is well known that in 1842, under the Compromise, the imports had fallen so low that the government was compelled to send to Europe to endeavour to effect a loan for its support even in a time of profound peace. If a cause has right on its side, such erroneous views cannot be required to be presented. In the tables that I shall now offer for consideration, I have pursued, as nearly as possible, a uniform course, commencing each period at the time at which the system might fairly be deemed to become operative, to wit: at the close of the fiscal year following the one in which the law was enacted. If error, then, exist at the commencement of the period, it will find its compensation at the close, and thus justice will be done to all.

There still remain two other points in regard to these tables, to which I have to ask your attention.

First. It is usual in almost all tables of import and export to exclude specie and bullion. This is wrong, and tends to produce error, and to prevent a proper understanding of the working of the system that may be under consideration. Gold and silver are commodities produced abroad, of which we consume large quantities, occasionally exporting the surplus; and there is no reason whatever why they should not be treated precisely as are coffee, wines, brandy, and other foreign commodities. When they are imported they come in exchange for our products, and the sum of merchandise and specie imported is the value of our exports. When exported, they go in lieu of our products, and should be treated as foreign merchandise re-exported. By deducting them from the value of the merchandise imported we obtain the value of our domestic exports.

Second. It is usual to affix to the commodities exported arbitrary prices, and thus to obtain their money value. These prices are fixed at the ports of shipment, and represent only what *we ask* for the commodities we have to sell, not what *we get* for them. They represent, too, the prices *minus* the earnings of the machinery employed in performing the work of transportation, which must then be guessed at. The consequence of all this is, that the tables published by the Treasury are totally worthless as guides to a proper understanding of the general course of trade. What is needed to obtain such an understanding is that the nation make out its accounts as it would do if it were a merchant, putting down not the price asked but the price received, and then balancing its books by ascertaining whether the year's business has increased or diminished its debts. The amount received for our exports constitutes their precise value, and to ascertain what is that amount we should take the value of merchandise imported, deducting therefrom any debt contracted, or adding thereto any debt paid off, during the year. Thus, if the imports be \$100,000,000, and the debt contracted by the transfer of stocks has been \$10,000,000, the amount paid for by our exports is only \$90,000,000. On the contrary, if we have paid off that amount of debt, it should be added, and we should thus obtain \$110,000,000 as the true value of the produce and merchandise exported. The freights are thus included.

To carry this fully into practice in the following tables would be impracticable, but it may be done in part. It is generally understood that the amount of American stocks, public and private, held in Europe in 1841 exceeded \$200,000,000, and there is reason to believe that they exceeded



by \$170,000,000 the amount held in November, 1834, when the great stock speculation commenced.\* By deducting this sum from the merchandise imported between the close of 1834 and the year 1841, we shall obtain the value of produce and merchandise exported. A part of this debt was absorbed in the years 1845, 1846, and 1847, while on the other hand new debts were created last year, and are now being created by the transmission of evidences of debt. To the imports of the three first named should be added the debt absorbed, and from those of the last two years should be deducted the debt created, and we should then obtain the actual amount paid for by produce and domestic merchandise exported, and by the shipping employed in the work of transportation.

There are other and earlier years in which corrections might be required, but they are of trifling amount by comparison with those to which I have referred. In those years small loans were made, but it is probable that nearly as much was paid off, except perhaps in 1825, in which a considerable amount of European debt was created. The amount, however, is so uncertain that I have not thought it worth while to make any correction therefor; although to do so might, and perhaps would, produce a sensible diminution in the value received for our produce exported prior to 1829, which would thereby be placed in a somewhat worse position than that in which I have represented it.

With these remarks, I will now proceed to lay before you the results of my inquiries. In doing so, I will give every fact that appears to me likely to throw light on this important question, concealing nothing. If, then, those who have arrived at conclusions different from mine, and are in possession of other facts, will put them together as I now do, we may by degrees arrive at the truth. It is the great question for the nation, and it is time that it should be examined as a purely scientific, and not as a party or sectional one.

## CHAPTER SECOND.

The average population of the Union in the several periods referred to, is thus estimated in the last Treasury Report:†

First. For the years from that ending Dec. 31, 1821, to that of

Dec. 31, 1829 . . . . .	11,247,000
Second. From Sept. 1829, to Sept. 1834‡ . . . . .	13,698,000
Third. From Sept. 1834, to Sept. 1841 . . . . .	16,226,000
Fourth. From Sept. 1841, to June, 1843 . . . . .	18,296,000
Fifth. From June, 1843, to June, 1847‡ . . . . .	19,771,000
Sixth. From June, 1847, to June, 1848 . . . . .	21,000,000
Seventh. From June, 1848, to June, 1849 . . . . .	21,700,000

\* Report of Select Committee on Banks of Issue: Evidence of Mr. I. Horsley Palmer, page 106.

† Page 68.

‡ As these years are frequently referred to separately, I give their population, on the same authority:—

1829-'30 . . . . .	12,856,165	1843-'44 . . . . .	19,034,332
1830-'31 . . . . .	13,377,415	1844-'45 . . . . .	19,525,749
1831-'32 . . . . .	13,698,665	1845-'46 . . . . .	20,017,165
1832-'33 . . . . .	14,119,915	1846-'47 . . . . .	20,508,582
1833-'34 . . . . .	14,541,165	1847-'48 . . . . .	21,000,000

The amount of foreign merchandise, specie included,\* retained in these several periods, has been as follows :—

		Total.	Annual Average.	Pr. head.
1821 to 1829	. . . . .	\$508,000,000	56,400,000	\$5.00
1830	. . . . .	55,500,000		4.32
1831	. . . . .	81,000,000		6.10
1832	. . . . .	75,500,000		5.51
1833	. . . . .	88,000,000		6.20
1834	. . . . .	103,000,000		7.08
1835 to 1841	. . . . .	854,000,000		
Deduct debt incurred	170,000,000	684,000,000	97,700,000	6.02
1842 to 1843 (21 months, ending June 30,)		145,000,000	82,000,000	4.48
1843-'44	. . . . .	96,000,000		5.03
1844-'45	. . . . .	101,000,000		5.16
1845-'46	. . . . .	110,000,000		
Add debt and back interest paid	. . . . .	5,000,000	115,000,000	5.75
1846-'47	. . . . .	138,000,000		
Do.	. . . . .	5,000,000	143,000,000	7
1847-'48	. . . . .	131,600,000		
Deduct debt incurred	8,000,000	121,600,000		5.88
1848-'49	. . . . .	134,700,000		
Do.	. . . . .	22,000,000	112,700,000	5.19

The facts derivable from an examination of the above accounts are as follows :—

First. That the amount received from foreign nations in exchange for our surplus products largely increased during the existence of the tariff of 1828.

Second. That the amount so received diminished greatly after the Compromise Bill began to become operative.

Third. That the amount so received from foreign nations was still further and largely diminished under the strictly revenue clauses of that bill, and that the tendency was downward when the system was changed.

Fourth. That the amount so received increased rapidly under the tariff of 1842, attaining nearly the same point that had been reached under the tariff of 1828, and that in both cases the tendency was still upwards when the system was changed.

Fifth. That the amount so received diminished in the year 1848.

Seventh. That the amount of debt incurred in the last two years must tend to produce a further diminution in future ones.

In establishing the scale of value of our exports, including the earnings of shipping, the following is the order to be pursued :—

First, and lowest. The strictly revenue clauses of the Compromise Act.

\* The movement of specie in those periods was as follows :—

1821 to 1829, Excess export	. . . . .	\$9,000,000	Deducted from the merchandise imported.
1830 to 1834, Excess import	. . . . .	25,000,000	Added thereto.
1835 to 1841, " "	. . . . .	27,000,000	do.
1842 and 1843, " "	. . . . .	20,000,000	do.
1844 to 1847, " "	. . . . .	18,000,000	do.
1848, Excess export	. . . . .	9,000,000	Deducted.
1849. " import	. . . . .	2,000,000	Added.

Second. The partially protective tariffs of 1816 and 1824.

Third. The Compromise Act.

Fourth. The tariff of 1828.

Fifth, and highest. The tariff of 1842.

Thus far, the tariff of 1846 stands below that of 1842, and the tendency is downward, but to what place in the scale it will descend can be determined only after it shall have been some years in operation.

### CHAPTER THIRD.

#### REVIEW OF THE COMMERCIAL POLICY OF THE LAST THIRTY YEARS.

I NOW proceed to show in detail the consumption of various commodities, of foreign and domestic production. In doing so, it will be necessary in some cases, to arrive at a correct understanding, to make allowances similar to those above given: my object being that of showing what was the power to *consume* that was derived from the power to *produce* commodities to be given in exchange for those which were consumed.\* It would be proper to do this in all, but the effect would be to render the whole somewhat complicated, besides involving much labour. In giving the imports of the period from 1834 to 1841, they will always be accompanied with the mark of *minus* one-fifth, so as to show the amount consumed and *paid for*. In giving those of 1845-6 and 1846-7, they will, in some important cases, be accompanied with that of *plus* one-twentieth, so as to show the quantity of merchandise imported in a previous period, and *then paid for* by the cancelling of certificates of debt. Those of 1848 will have the mark of *minus* one-seventh, to show the amount paid for by the re-export of nine millions of foreign merchandise in the form of specie, and the export of eight millions of certificates of debt. Of the imports of the year ending in June last, amounting to \$134,700,000, about \$22,000,000, or one-sixth, were obtained in exchange for such certificates, and will be so marked.

The total value of pig, bar and manufactured IRON, of every description, imported into the Union, since 1821, has been as follows:—

Years ending,		Per head,
Sept. 30, 1821 to 1829, average	\$5,400,000	48 cents.
" 1830	5,900,000	46 "
" 1831	7,200,000	54 "
" 1832	8,800,000	64 "
" 1833	7,700,000	55 "
" 1834	8,500,000	59 "
" 1835 to 1841	\$10,000,000 — $\frac{1}{5}$	49 "
" 1842 to June 30, 1843, average	5,500,000	30 "
June 30, 1844	5,700,000	30 "
" 1845	9,000,000	46 "
" 1846	\$5,830,000 + $\frac{1}{20}$	31 "
" 1847	+ $\frac{1}{20}$	44 "
" 1848	12,500,000 — $\frac{1}{7}$	50 "
" 1849	13,833,094 — $\frac{1}{6}$	53 "

\* See page 9.



We see here, that the value imported and *paid for*, largely increased from 1830 to 1834, under the protective tariff of 1828; that it diminished considerably between 1834 and 1841, and that it reached the lowest point in 1841-2 and 1842-3. Thenceforward it rose, and the year 1846-7 shows an advance of about fifty per cent. from the lowest point. It is therefore obvious, that the power to pay for foreign iron increased under protection, and diminished with its withdrawal. I give now the *quantity* of various kinds of IRON imported:

	Pig, tons.	Old, tons.	Rolled, tons.	Hoop, tons.	Steel, tons.	Ham'd, tons.	Total, tons.	Pr h. lbs.
1821 to 1829, average,	1550	—	5400	1500	1200	26,000	35,650	7
1830, . . . . .	1129	—	6449	1038	1223	30,693	40,532	7
1831, . . . . .	6448	—	17,245	2532	1710	23,308	51,243	8½
1832, . . . . .	10,151	—	20,387*	2853	2146	38,150	73,687	12
1833, . . . . .	9330	998	28,028*	3350	2131	36,129	79,961	13
1834, . . . . .	11,113	1617	28,896*	2214	2431	31,784	78,055	12
1835 to 1841, average — ½	8800	640	36,000*	2600	2150	24,000	74,190	10
1842-3, average, . . . .	14,500	500	46,000†	2900	2400	14,750	81,050	10
1844, . . . . .	26,050	5770	46,000	3600	2800	17,500	101,720	12
1845, . . . . .	27,000	5800	51,000	5800	2800	18,176	110,576	13
1846, . . . . .	24,000	2350	24,000	5040	5200	21,800	82,390	9
1847, . . . . .	27,800	1850	40,000	6000	5400	15,300	96,350	10½
1848, . . . . . — ¼	44,000	5700	70,000	8300	5850	17,000	150,850	16
1849, . . . . . — ⅓	88,000	8000	145,000	10,000		9,000	260,000	27

The quantity *paid for by our exports* was thus almost doubled before the termination of the second period, in 1834; while it diminished under the compromise, and still further under the revenue system. As the tariff of 1842 came into activity, we find a rapid increase in the power to purchase, until the import became checked by the vast increase in the price abroad, and in the manufacture at home.

#### DOMESTIC PRODUCTION OF IRON.

In 1810, the whole number of furnaces in the Union was 153, yielding 54,000 tons of metal, equal to 16 pounds per head of the population.

1821, the manufacture was in a state of ruin.

1828, the product had reached 130,000 tons, having little more than doubled in eighteen years.

1829, it was 142,000. Increase in one year, nearly ten per cent.

1830, " 165,000. Increase in two years, more than twenty-five per cent.

1831, " 191,000. Increase in three years, about fifty per cent.

1832, " 200,000, giving an increase in three years of above sixty per cent.

1840, the quantity given by the census was 286,000, but a committee of the Home League, in New York, made it 347,700 tons. Taking the medium of the two, it would give about 315,000 tons, being an increase in eight years of fifty per cent.

1842, a large portion of the furnaces were closed, and the product had fallen to probably little more than 200,000, but certainly less than 230,000 tons.

1846, it was estimated, by the Secretary of the Treasury, at 765,000 tons, having trebled in four years.

1847, it was supposed to have reached the amount of not less than 800,000 tons.

1848, it became stationary.

1849, many furnaces being already closed, the production of the present year cannot be estimated above 650,000 tons; but, from the accumulation of stock and the difficulty of selling it, it is obvious that the diminution next year will be greater.

\* Railroad iron free of duty. † Duty re-imposed.

	Domestic product.	Per head.	Import. Per head.	Total consumption.
1821 to 1829, average, .	90,000	18	7	25
1830, . . . . .	165,000	29	7	36
1831, . . . . .	191,000	33	8 $\frac{2}{3}$	41 $\frac{2}{3}$
1832, . . . . .	210,000	35	12	47
1833, . . . . .	210,000*	33	13	46
1834, . . . . .	210,000*	33	12	45
1835 to 1841, average, .	250,000	35	11	46
1842-1843, average, .	230,000	28	10	38
1844, . . . . .	380,000	45	12	57
1845, . . . . .	500,000	58	13	71
1846, . . . . .	765,000	86	9	95
1847, . . . . .	800,000	88	10 $\frac{2}{3}$	98 $\frac{2}{3}$
1848, . . . . .	800,000	86	19	105
Deduct from this the quantity imported in exchange for certificates of debt, and therefore remaining to be paid for at a future time, . . . . .				3
There will remain . . . . .				102
If now we further deduct from this the accumulation of stock on hand, we shall find the consumption not exceeding that of the preceding year, say . . . . .				98 $\frac{2}{3}$
1849, . . . . .	650,000	67	32	99
The value imported in this period is \$13,800,000, and the amount of debt incurred is \$22,000,000, chiefly for this iron. The quantity on hand is variously estimated between 250 and 300 thousand tons. Taking the former, the amount per head would be . . . . .				26
Which being deducted, would leave the consumption at . . . . .				73

From 1821 to 1829, the cost of iron, in labour, was high, as is shown in the fact that the consumption was but twenty-five pounds per head. In 1832, it had risen to 47 pounds; but, railroad iron being then freed from duty, the consumption of the two following years fell off, indicating an increased difficulty of obtaining it. Thence to 1841, the average power of consumption appears to have remained almost perfectly stationary; but, in the two following years, we find it receding rapidly. As the tariff of 1842 comes into operation, there is a rapid increase in the power of consumption, indicating a diminution in the amount of labour required for its purchase; and the year 1846-7 shows it attaining a point far higher than ever before known, being almost 100 pounds per head. With the year 1847-8, the domestic production declined in its ratio to population, and the import increased; but the total quantity in market was very little greater than in the previous year, yet the close of that year showed an accumulation of stock on hand. In 1849 we find a rapid increase of import and diminution of production, yet the total quantity brought to market is less per head than in 1846-7, and of that there is already so vast an accumulation that the seaports are filled with it, and the stock on hand at the furnaces is such, that many will be forced to stop work, as numbers have already done.† It is obvious that the difficulty

\* Railroad iron, free of duty.

† Pennsylvania is the great iron-producing State of the Union, and we may form some idea of the accumulation of stock, or the diminution of production, there, from the following facts. The pig iron sent to market by the one route of the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal, from the opening of navigation to the first of September, 1848, amounted to 24,000 tons; whereas, in the same period of 1849, it fell to little over 12,000 tons, and the bar iron from 5000 to 1250 tons.

of obtaining iron is increasing, and that the consumption is rapidly diminishing, with a tendency to still further diminution.

The important facts to be derived from this examination are—first, the small increase of importation that results, even temporarily, from the abolition of the duty. During the period from 1830 to 1832, railroad iron paid duty, and yet the importation trebled in that time, and the last year was far the greatest of the three. For nine years after, it was totally free from duty; and, although much of that which was imported for railroads is said to have been used for other purposes, the increase averages but seventy per cent. By the tariff of 1841,\* railroad iron was rendered subject to duty, and the import of rolled iron in 1842 and 1843 was 46,000 tons, being two-thirds more than was imported free of duty in 1834.

Second. That, under the protective tariff of 1828, the total consumption, per head, increased, in four years, fifty per cent. That, under the system which prevailed from 1832 to 1842-3, consumption was almost stationary, and was probably less per head than it had been at the commencement of the period. That, under the tariff of 1842, the average consumption increased in the first year from thirty-nine to fifty-seven pounds, and that, in 1846 and 1847, it attained the height of almost one hundred pounds per head, exceeding by 150 per cent. the consumption of the free trade period of 1842-3.

If, now, we look at the single article of railroad iron, we find similar results. Up to 1842, not a single ton of it had ever been made in this country, and yet the average consumption of rolled iron, of every description, in the ten years from 1832 to 1842, free of duty as it was, was but about 36,000 tons. Commenced only in 1843, the manufacture of railroad bars in 1845 had already reached about 50,000 tons, and, in 1847, it had attained nearly 100,000 tons, and yet the average import of rolled iron for the four years was nearly as great as before. The domestic production has now fallen almost to nothing, and yet the import has been only 174,000, of which, it is said, there is now on hand a supply adequate to meet the demand, such as it is at present, for two years to come.

The questions to be settled are—Which is the system under which iron is most cheaply furnished? Which is the one under which it is most readily obtained by those who desire to use it? If free-trade be the one, then the power to import, under it, ought to grow more rapidly than the power to produce diminishes; but we see here that the power to import diminishes with the power to produce, and grows with the growth of the power of production, being greatest under protection.

## COAL.

	Anthracite. Tons.	Foreign. Tons.	Total. Tons.	Consumption per 1000 of populat'n. 6 tons.
1821 to 1829, average,	37,000	30,000	67,000	
1830, . . . . .	142,000	54,000	196,000	15
1831, . . . . .	216,000	34,000	250,000	19
1832, . . . . .	318,000	66,000	384,000	28
1833, . . . . .	395,000	85,000	480,000	34
1834, . . . . .	451,000	67,000	518,000	35
1835 to 1836, . . .	671,000	78,000	749,000	50
1837, . . . . .	881,000	140,000	1,021,000	64
1838 to 1841, . . .	850,000	145,000	995,000	58
1842, . . . . .	1,108,000	141,000	1,249,000	69

\* This was a provisional tariff, having for its sole object the increase of revenue, and was limited to alterations in a few articles.



	Anthracite. Tons.	Foreign. Tons.	Total. Tons.	Consumption per 1000 of populat'n.
1843, . . . . .	1,312,000	55,000	1,367,000	74
1844, . . . . .	1,631,000	87,000	1,718,000	90
1845, . . . . .	2,023,000	86,000	2,109,000	108
1846, . . . . .	2,343,000	156,000	2,499,000	125
1847, . . . . .	2,982,000	148,000	3,130,000	152
1848, . . . . .	3,089,000	196,000	3,285,000	156
1849, . . . . .	3,200,000	200,000	3,400,000	156

In this case, it has been necessary to separate the years 1842 and 1843, because of the whole of the latter coming within the action of the tariff of 1842,\* the account of the domestic production being made up to the close, instead of the middle of the year, as in the case of imports.

The facts that here present themselves are worthy of careful consideration.

When we produced little coal, we imported little, the total consumption being only six tons per thousand of the population. As the production grew, the import grew, and thus, in 1846 and 1847, when we produced *eighty* times as much as in the period from 1821 to 1829, we imported five times more.

From 1829 to 1834, and thence to 1837, the increase of consumption was rapid. Thence to 1841, it diminished ten per cent. In 1842, it was scarcely higher than it had been five years before. In the five years which followed, it rose from 69 to 152 tons, showing a rapid diminution in the quantity of labour required to be given in exchange for it. In 1848, under the action of the tariff of 1846, the production became almost stationary, and the diminished power of consumption is shown in the fact that although the quantity sent to market maintains the same ratio to population, much of it is sold at a loss to the producer.

With every step in the growth of the home production of coal, the money price has steadily diminished. That of a ton of anthracite in 1826, in Philadelphia, was six, eight, and sometimes ten dollars, and yet the whole import was only 970,000 bushels, or about 30,000 tons. In 1846, the price of anthracite was about four dollars, and yet the import was 156,000 tons. It would appear from this, that when a nation is capable of supplying itself, other nations, desiring to sell, must come to them and sell at the lowest price, and the consumption is large; but when it cannot supply itself, it must go abroad to seek supplies, and pay the highest price, and then consumption is small. Applying this to iron, we find that when we had to seek abroad for nearly all our supply, it sold at prices twice or thrice as great as those at which it is now obtained.

In 1846 and 1847, notwithstanding the vast increase in the supply of coal, so great was the consumption that we had to go abroad to make up the deficiency, and to pay the high prices which our own demand largely tended to produce, a state of things which could not have happened had we been prepared to supply the whole demand.

It remains to be seen whether the converse of this proposition may not be true, to wit, that when a nation makes a market at home for nearly all its products, other nations have to come and seek what they require, and pay the highest price; and that, when it does not make a market at home, markets must be sought abroad, and then sales must be made at the lowest prices. If both of these be true, it would follow that the way to sell at the highest prices and buy at the lowest is to buy and sell at home.

\* It came into action on the 30th of August of that year.



## COTTON.

## IMPORT OF COTTON MANUFACTURE.

Years ending			Per head.
September 30,	1821 to 1829, average, .....	\$9,454,000	84 cts.
"	1830, .....	7,862,000	61
"	1831, .....	16,090,000	1.21
"	1832, .....	10,399,000	76
"	1833, .....	7,660,000	54
"	1834, .....	10,145,000	70
"	1835 to 1841, ..... 12,000 — $\frac{1}{5}$ ...	9,600,000	59
"	1842 to June 30, 1843, average, .....	7,184,000	39
June 30,	1844, .....	13,641,000	72
"	1845, .....	13,863,000	71
"	1846, .....	13,500,000	67 $\frac{1}{2}$
"	1847, .....	16,071,000	78
"	1848, ..... \$18,412,000 — $\frac{1}{5}$ ...	15,582,000	74
"	1849, ..... 15,180,000 — $\frac{1}{5}$ ...	12,650,000	56

The number of yards of cloth imported in 10 years is thus given. I have been unable to complete this table, or it should be given in full. I give all I have met with :

1831, .....	68,577,000
1835, .....	53,974,000
1836, .....	56,931,000
1837, .....	23,774,000
1838, .....	20,240,000
1839, .....	42,418,000
1840, .....	20,011,000
1842-3, .....	8,936,000
1844-5, .....	34,500,000
1845-6, .....	36,800,000

The differences here appear much more striking than in the table above. The diminution of consumption under the free-trade system is very regular, and the increase under protection nearly as much so.

Owing to the variety of cotton goods imported, it is difficult to estimate the weight of cotton contained in them ; but, in the following table, I have made a rude estimate, with a view to show the growth of domestic consumption. It must be borne in mind that a large portion of the foreign commodities are of the finer and more costly descriptions, and that the weight is therefore small when compared with the value.

Crop of	Taken by Northern manufacturers.	Taken by Southern manufacturers.	Per head, domes- tic.	Per head, foreign.	Total, p. head.
1825-6 to 1829-30, average, bales	110,000	.....	4 lbs.	1 $\frac{1}{4}$ lbs.	5 $\frac{1}{4}$
1830-31, .....	182,000	.....	5 $\frac{1}{2}$	1	6 $\frac{1}{2}$
1831-32, .....	173,000	.....	5 $\frac{1}{2}$	2	7 $\frac{1}{2}$
1832-33, .....	194,000	.....	5 $\frac{1}{2}$	1 $\frac{1}{4}$	6 $\frac{3}{4}$
1833-34, .....	196,000	.....	5 $\frac{1}{2}$	0 $\frac{3}{4}$	6 $\frac{1}{4}$
1834-35, .....	216,000	.....	5 $\frac{3}{4}$	1 $\frac{1}{4}$	7
1835-36, to 1841-42, average, ...	263,000	.....	6 $\frac{1}{2}$	1	7 $\frac{1}{2}$
1842-43, .....	325,000	.....	7	0 $\frac{3}{4}$	7 $\frac{3}{4}$
1843-44, .....	347,000	.....	7 $\frac{1}{4}$	1 $\frac{1}{4}$	8 $\frac{1}{2}$
1844-45, .....	389,000	.....	8	1 $\frac{1}{4}$	9 $\frac{1}{4}$
1845-46, .....	423,000	30,000	9 $\frac{1}{4}$	1 $\frac{1}{4}$	10 $\frac{1}{2}$
1846-47, .....	428,000	40,000	9 $\frac{1}{4}$	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	10 $\frac{3}{4}$
1847-48, .....	531,000	75,000	12	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	13 $\frac{1}{2}$
1848-49, .....	518,000	100,000	11 $\frac{3}{10}$	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	12 $\frac{1}{2}$

In estimating the domestic consumption, I have throughout taken the bale at four hundred pounds, although aware that there has been a gradual increase of the weight. This change would be important to be considered, if it were my object to compare 1847 with the distant year 1831; but it is unimportant when the object in view is the comparison of years which are near together, as is the fact.

The results in this case correspond almost precisely with those obtained from the examination of iron and coal. The home consumption of the crop of 1834-5, per head, was almost fifty per cent. greater than the average of previous years, while the import remained almost undisturbed. Under the Compromise, consumption appears to have remained almost perfectly stationary, the increase of domestic production being compensated by diminished importation. In 1842-3, the consumption per head was scarcely greater than it had been eight years before, when it should have doubled. With the operation of the tariff of 1842, we find the consumption of domestic products 75 per cent. greater, while the import is also almost doubled. It would appear obvious, that the power to obtain clothing in return for labour increased in both protective periods, and diminished with the approach to free trade. With 1848-9, the demand for Northern manufactures diminished; and, as many mills are now closed that were at work but a few months since,\* there is reason to believe that the power to obtain clothing in return for labour is in a course of gradual diminution.

A portion of the cotton worked up at home has been exported, and was therefore not consumed at home. To have made allowance for this would have made the table very complicated, and it did not appear to be necessary, as the proportions were well preserved, having been about a million of dollars when the home consumption was 100,000 bales, two millions when it rose to 200,000, three millions out of 300,000, and five millions out of 500,000 bales.

#### WOOL.

##### IMPORT OF WOOLLENS.

Years ending			Per head.
September 30,	1821 to 1829, average,	\$8,900,000	79 cents
"	1830, . . . . .	5,766,000	45
"	1831, . . . . .	12,627,000	95
"	1832, . . . . .	9,992,000	75
"	1833, . . . . .	13,262,000	93
"	1834, . . . . .	11,879,000	82
"	1835 to 1841, av., \$13,950,000 — $\frac{1}{2}$	11,160,000	69
"	1842 to June 30, 1843, . . .	6,300,000	34
June 30,	1844, . . . . .	9,475,000	50
"	1845, . . . . .	10,666,000	55
"	1846, . . . . .	10,089,000	50
"	1847, . . . . .	10,570,000	51
"	1848, . . . \$15,230,000 — $\frac{1}{4}$	13,000,000	62
"	1849, . . . 13,704,000 — $\frac{1}{8}$	11,400,000	53

\* Within the last six months there have been many failures among those engaged in the business; and, in these cases, the mills are not only closed, but likely so to remain.

The import into Cincinnati may be taken as evidence of the course of affairs in the West, and here we have the same result:

1846-7, . . . . .	12,528 bales.
1847-8, . . . . .	13,476
1848-9, . . . . .	9,058

We see, thus, that notwithstanding the extreme lowness of price, the consumption has diminished.

Prior to the passage of the tariff of 1824, the woollen manufacture was in a very depressed condition; and, in 1825, the number of sheep was only fourteen millions,\* producing about thirty-five millions of pounds of wool. Thenceforward the number increased, and the crop of 1829, 1830 and 1831, was estimated at fifty millions of pounds, the produce of twenty millions of sheep. At the close of 1834, there had been a further increase,\* but to what extent we are not informed; but the value of the woollen manufacture was estimated at 65 millions of dollars against 40 millions in 1831. In 1840, the census returns show but 19,311,000, the number having diminished while the population had largely increased. The depression of 1841-2 was accompanied by the sacrifice of sheep to a considerable extent; yet so rapid was the subsequent change, that the number, in 1845, was estimated at twenty-five millions,† and in 1848 at twenty-eight millions. Ohio had, in 1846, only 2,065,000; but, in 1848, the number had risen to 3,677,000. The number in New York, in 1845, was 6,443,000, and, subsequently to that date, it had largely increased.

The deliveries on the New York canals, and at Pittsburgh, in 1840, were one-fifth of the total production by the census; and, since that date, they are thus stated—‡

1841, . . . .	5,094,035	1845, . . . .	13,267,609
1842, . . . .	4,823,881	1846, . . . .	12,269,537
1843, . . . .	5,713,289	1847, . . . .	16,325,987
1844, . . . .	6,798,769	1848, . . . .	11,665,540

Even this does not mark the whole increase, as the woollens factories of the interior of New York and other States absorb much that would otherwise pass on the canals, destined for distant places.

With these very imperfect data, we may now form some estimate of the consumption of this most important commodity. In estimating the weight contained in the cloth imported, I have taken it as being worth one dollar per pound, and therefore the figures which represent the *value* per head, give also the *weight* per head.

Average of	Millions of sheep.	Pounds of wool.	Imports. Pounds.	Total, domestic manufacture.	Per head. Total, dom. & for.
1821 to 1829, . . . .	15	37,500,000	2,000,000	39,500,000	3.50 4.29
1830, . . . . .	20	50,000,000	669,000	50,669,000	3.90 4.35
1831, . . . . .	21	52,500,000	5,622,000	58,122,000	4.40 5.35
1832, . . . . .	22	55,000,000	4,042,000	59,062,000	4.40 5.15
1833, . . . . .	23	57,500,000	950,000	58,450,000	4.15 5.08
1834, . . . . .	24	60,000,000	2,341,000	62,341,000	4.30 5.12
1835 to 1841, . . . .	22	55,700,000	10,000,000	65,000,000	4. 4.69
1842 and 1843, . . . .	19	48,000,000	7,500,000	55,500,000	3. 3.34
1844, . . . . .	22	55,000,000	23,800,000	78,800,000	4.10 4.60
1845, . . . . .	24	60,000,000	28,800,000	88,800,000	4.50 5.05
1846, . . . . .	26	65,000,000	16,500,000	81,500,000	4.10 4.60
1847, . . . . .	27	67,500,000	8,460,000	75,960,000	3.70 4.20
1848, . . . . .	28	70,000,000	11,380,000	81,380,000	3.90 4.52
1849, . . . . .			17,860,000		

By the tariff of 1846, the duty on many descriptions of foreign wool was raised, while that on cloths was lowered; which accounts for the great diminution in the quantity imported.

That this is very incorrect there is no doubt; but it will enable us to make some comparison between the increase of imports as compared with the diminution of home production. From 1830 to 1834, the production

\* Pitkin's Statistics, p. 488.

† Patent Office Report, 1847, p. 213.

‡ Merchant's Magazine, Vol. XXI., p. 217.

grew, and the import was large. From 1835 to 1841, the former largely diminished in its ratio to population; and the foreign cloths *paid for* in that period fell to sixty-nine cents per head. In the revenue period, from June, 1841, to June, 1843, production was very small, and the import fell to about thirty-four cents per head. In the four succeeding years, both grew rapidly. Under the tariff of 1846, there is a slight increase of import; but the home manufacture has diminished. The power to obtain cloth in exchange for labour has, therefore, invariably grown in the protective periods, and diminished with every approach to free trade.

#### PRODUCTION OF LEAD.

The arrivals at New Orleans have been as follows:—

	Pigs.		Pigs.		Pigs.
1828-'29, * average,	164,000	1834, . . . . .	202,000	1845, . . . . .	732,000
1830, . . . . .	254,000	1835 to 1841, . . . . .	298,000	1846, . . . . .	785,000
1831, . . . . .	151,000	1842, . . . . .	473,000	1847, . . . . .	659,000
1832, . . . . .	122,000	1843, . . . . .	571,000	1848, . . . . .	606,000
1833, . . . . .	180,000	1844, . . . . .	639,000	1849, . . . . .	508,000

We see here that the average of the seven years, from 1835 to 1841, was little greater than the product of 1830. The temporary tariff of September, 1841, raised the duty to five cents per pound, and production rose to almost 800,000 pigs. Since the passage of that of 1846, it has fallen to 500,000, and for this diminished supply there is little demand.

We have thus far seen that the application of labour and capital to the opening of mines, the erection of furnaces, mills, and factories, and to the conducting of such works, was arrested at the close of 1834, and that it did not recommence until after the passage of the tariff of 1842. We have also seen that it increased rapidly from 1843 to 1847, that it became stationary in 1848, and is now retrograding. Both seek to be employed, and if denied employment at home they must seek it abroad. If employed at home, there is a tendency to concentration and combination of action. If sent abroad, there is a tendency to dispersion, with diminished power of combination. One of these courses tends to increase the reward of labour, the other to diminish it. With a view to ascertain the effects of the two systems, I give,

First, The amount of IMMIGRATION, as showing how far the wages of labour tended to invite the people of foreign nations to come and reside amongst us, and,

Second, The amount of SHIPPING built, to show how far the establishment of an import trade of MEN, the cargo that pays the highest freights, tended to increase the facilities provided for the export of merchandise:—

#### IMIGRATION.

1821 to 1829, . . . . .	12,000	1842-3, . . . . .	83,133
1830, . . . . .	27,153	1844, . . . . .	74,607
1831, . . . . .	23,074	1845, . . . . .	102,415
1832, . . . . .	45,287	1846, . . . . .	147,051
1833, . . . . .	56,547	1847, . . . . .	234,742
1834, . . . . .	65,335	1848, . . . . .	229,492
1835 to 1841, . . . . .	67,520	1849, . . . . .	299,610

\* These are the earliest years for which I have met with any accounts.



	Total shipping built. tons.	Per thousand. of population.	Steamers built.	Per million of population.
1821 to 1829, average,	90,000	8	1823-29 35	3.1
1830, . . .	58,000	4.5	37	3
1831, . . .	85,000	6.4	34	2.6
1832, . . .	144,000	10.5	100	7.2
1833, . . .	161,000	11.4	65	4.6
1834, . . .	118,000	8.1	68	4.7
1835 to 1841, . . .	108,000	6.6	92	5.7
1842-3, . . .	91,000	5	108	5.8
1844, (nine months,) . . .	103,000=137,000	7.2	163=217	11.4
1845, . . .	146,000	7.5	163	8.5
1846, . . .	188,000	9.4	225	11.5
1847, . . .	243,000	11.8	198	9.7
1848, . . .	316,000	15	175	8.3
1849, . . .	253,000	11.8	208	9.6

We see here a large increase in the years from 1830 to 1834, followed by a gradual diminution until we reach 1843, after which the rise is very rapid.

On a former occasion, I stated that immigration was not affected by changes of policy until after the lapse of more time than was required for other of the subjects we have had under consideration. A change tends to raise or depress the value of labour—to raise or depress the price of men—and after a rise has been effected, men come to offer their labour for sale. It will be seen that the number in 1831 was less than in 1830, and that it was not until 1832 that it rose. With the exception of 1835, it continued to rise until 1836-7, when it reached 78,083, after which it fell. In 1843-4, it felt the effect of the disastrous year 1842, and the number was only 74,000; and it was not until 1844-5 that it began to grow rapidly. At the present moment it is large, because of the great demand for labour in the years that have passed, but it is now feeling the effect of the present diminished demand, and consequent fall of wages.

Such, likewise, is the case with shipping. The first effect of a rise of wages is to increase the power to obtain the necessaries of life, and it is not until after that shall have been done that the power to consume foreign commodities tends materially to increase. The increase of ship-building did not commence until 1832. It fell off in 1838. Thus far the movement is precisely the same as that of immigration. It recommenced in 1844, somewhat in advance of immigration. It is now maintained by that, and that alone, and when that is falling off, it must fall too. The close connection between the power to secure valuable return-freights and the power to build ships, is shown in the following table, in which the movements of both are shown:—

Immigration.	Shipping built.	Immigration.	Shipping built.
1821-31, aver., 14,000 . . .	87,000*	1843, . . .	75,000 . . .
1832, . . . 45,000 . . .	144,000	1844, . . .	74,000 . . .
1833, . . . 56,000 . . .	161,000	1845, . . .	102,000 . . .
1834, . . . 65,000 . . .	118,000	1846, . . .	147,000 . . .
1835, . . . 53,000 . . .	60,000	1847, . . .	239,742 . . .
1836, . . . 62,000 . . .	113,000	1848, . . .	229,492 . . .
1837, . . . 78,000 . . .	122,000	1849, . . .	299,610 . . .
1838-42, aver., 76,000 . . .	120,000		

The amount of shipping at present *employed* is, probably, less than it was two years since. A vast quantity now lies idle in the ports of California, and it is to replace it that ships are now being built.† How far the immigration

\* Average of last two years only 71,000.

† The reason for now building ships may be found in the fact stated in the following paragraph, which I take from one of the papers of the day:—

“It is a remarkable fact, that of all the ships arrived in the bay of San Francisco from

of the ensuing year is likely to afford inducements for increasing our tonnage may be judged from the following comparative view of the arrivals at New York in the last four months of the two past years, as compared with the present one, furnished by the Commissioners of Immigration:—

September, October, November, and December,	1847.	1848.	1849.
	44,137	61,310	48,715

Instead of an increase of about forty per cent., there is a diminution of above twenty per cent.; and that this decrease must go on, will be obvious from the facts contained in the following paragraph, which I take from the *New York Herald*:—

“EMIGRATION TO EUROPE.—The fine and well-trying packet-ship, Ashburton, sailed yesterday for Liverpool, having on board 104 passengers, who having taken a glimpse at ‘the land of liberty,’ and not finding it the El Dorado they expected, came to the conclusion of returning homeward. They were principally natives of Ireland. The Jamestown and Constellation sail to-morrow with similar cargoes.”

Every man who thus returns prevents the emigration of a hundred that would otherwise have crossed the Atlantic.

I propose now to show the tendency to DEPOPULATION, as marked by the sale of PUBLIC LANDS, compared with immigration:—

	Land sold. Acres.	Per head of Immigration.		Land sold. Acres.	Per head of Immigration.
1821–29, average,	825,000 .	69	1843, . .	1,605,000 .	21
1830, . . .	1,244,000 .	46	1844, . .	1,754,000 .	23
1831, . . .	1,929,000 .	83	1845, . .	1,843,000 .	18
1832, . . .	2,777,000 .	61	1846, . .	2,263,000 .	15
1833, . . .	2,462,000 .	44	1847, . .	2,521,000 .	11
1834, . . .	4,658,000 .	70	1848, . .	2,747,000 .	13†
1835–41, average,	7,150,000 .	105†	1849, not obtained.	. .	‡
1842, . . .	1,129,000 .	11			

At no period of our history has the process of depopulation proceeded with the vigour that is now manifested. Emigrants from Europe are now returning home, disappointed; while the emigration to the West is almost marvellous. The quantity of land sold does not, as I understand, give any clue to the quantity occupied, because of the facilities afforded by the law to squatters.

It is estimated, we are told, that from thirty thousand to fifty thousand have been added to the population of Iowa within *six weeks*, and that, by the close of navigation, the population will have increased one-fourth since the 1st of September. Such is the course of things in regard to all the new States, west and south-west; and, if to this be added the emigration to California, it may be doubted if the population of the old States will be as large at the close of the year as it was at the commencement.

the Atlantic ports, some of which have been anchored there for near four months, not one is advertised for a return trip home. This, of course, is easily accounted for. There is no freight to come back, but passengers and gold dust, and as these mostly prefer the steamers, the ships have nothing to do but to wait and see what circumstances may do for them. Meanwhile, the absence of so many vessels, and the improbability of an early return, are having a strengthening influence upon home freights. Rates are long most rapidly advance; and were it spring time now, instead of fall, I think it would be difficult to negotiate engagements at present prices.”

A vast amount of capital has been locked up in ships that are idle, and others must now be built to take their place. If they were back again, ship-building would now be entirely suspended.

† To this must be added the occupation of Texas and Oregon.

‡ To these must be added the occupation of California.

## PRODUCTION OF FOOD.

The power to supply food to those who come to live amongst us, and also to send it abroad in exchange for other commodities, may be taken as some evidence of the productiveness of labour applied to its cultivation, and I therefore give the following statement of the export and import of wheat and flour, in bushels of the former:—

	Exports.	Imports.	Population by immigration.	Depopulation.
1821–29, average,	4,400,000		12,000	69
1830, . . .	6,100,000		27,000	46
1831, . . .	9,441,000		23,000	83
1832, . . .	4,407,000		45,000	61
1833, . . .	4,811,000		56,000	44
1834, . . .	4,113,000		65,000	70
1835, . . .	3,914,000	311,000	63,000	105 Texas and Oregon.
1836, . . .	2,529,000	650,000		
1837, . . .	1,610,000	4,000,000		
1838, . . .	2,247,000	927,000		
1839, . . .	4,712,000		72,000	
1840, . . .	11,198,000			
1841, . . .	8,447,000		88,000	11
1842, . . .	7,237,000			
1843, . . .	4,519,000			21
1844, . . .	7,751,000		74,000	23
1845, . . .	6,365,000		102,000	18
1846, . . .	13,061,000		147,000	15
1847, . . .	26,312,000	20,000	234,742	11
1848, . . .	12,631,000	369,000	229,000	13
1849, . . .	9,500,000		299,610	

It is here shown that, notwithstanding the rapid growth of manufactures in the period from 1830 to 1834, the export of food was not only maintained but it increased. The tendency to depopulation had diminished, and the power to obtain iron to assist in the work of cultivation had increased. Thereafter, with the increasing tendency to depopulation, as immigration and manufactures and the power to obtain iron became stationary, the production of food so far diminished that the price rose to such a point as to render it profitable to import it; and it may be doubted if, notwithstanding the increase of numbers, the whole quantity produced between 1835 and 1840 was greater than in the five previous years. From 1843, we find it gradually increasing, notwithstanding the vast amount of labour employed in producing coal, iron, cotton and woollen goods, ships, steamboats, &c. How great was the increase may be seen by the following comparison of the returns under the census of 1840, and the Patent Office estimates for 1847:—

	Wheat.	Barley.	Oats.	Rye.	Buckwh't.	Ind. Corn.	Totals.
1840, . . .	84,823,000	4,161,000	123,071,000	18,645,000	7,291,000	377,531,000	615,522,000
1847, . . .	114,245,000	5,649,000	167,867,000	29,222,000	11,673,000	539,350,000	867,826,000
Increase,	29,422,000	1,488,000	44,797,000	10,577,000	4,382,000	161,819,000	252,304,000

We have here an increase of no less than 40 per cent. in seven years, during which the increase of population was but 23 per cent. Equally divided among the whole people, there would be 36 bushels per head in the one case, and 42 in the other; and thus we see that the increase in the facility of obtaining the machinery of cultivation is attended by increase in the product of cultivation; while increase in the power to produce cotton and woollen cloth enables the farmer to obtain for each bushel produced a larger amount of clothing than before.

The net export is as follows, per head of the population:—

1821 to 1829, . . .	·39	1834, . . .	·29	1845, . . .	·33
1830, . . .	·47	1835 to 1841, . . .	·25	1846, . . .	·65
1831, . . .	·71	1842-3, . . .	·31	1847, . . .	1·28
1832, . . .	·32	1844, . . .	·41	1848, . . .	·60
1833, . . .	·35			1849, . . .	·45

We see, thus, that with the exception of the year of the famine in Ireland, it has never reached a bushel per head, and that it has invariably been largest in the periods of protection—those periods in which the largest and most valuable home freights could be obtained. With the approach to free trade the power to maintain trade has diminished; and as we have receded from it and have approached protection, it has increased with the growth of immigration.

The effect of this is seen in the constantly increasing quantity of Canadian produce that passes through New York on the way to England. It is stated that while in 1848 only 50,000 barrels of Canadian flour passed through New York, the quantity in 1849 that came through by the single route of Oswego was 200,000 barrels, and that there were, in addition, 623,000 bushels of wheat. This, being of foreign production, has, of course, to be deducted from the amount of exports; but if the import of MEN should diminish, freights outward must rise, and the tendency to send flour or wheat to market through the ports of the Union will pass away.

What was, prior to the census of 1840, the production of grain, it is not now possible to ascertain; but we know that, in the period from 1830 to 1834, prices were moderate and consumption was large. It is not probable that it was as much per head as was given by the census for 1840, because the increased facilities of transportation in the latter period enabled the farmer to give more of his labour to cultivation. If it be taken at thirty bushels per head, it will probably not vary greatly from the truth. In the following period, production was so small that prices rose to a point that permitted importation from Europe; and the advance so far exceeded that of wages as to cause almost universal disturbance between employers and workmen. It may be doubted if it then exceeded twenty-five bushels per head. By degrees, the tendency to depopulation diminished; and, in 1840, we find it thirty-six bushels, to rise to forty-two in 1847. The same causes that diminished production in 1836 are now again at work. Immense numbers of people are in motion changing their places of labour; and those that have gone to California, New Mexico, the Salt Lake, &c., can scarcely be taken at less than a hundred thousand. These men are not now producers; and thus; while we have this year added to our population 280,000 persons from abroad requiring to be fed, we have exported great numbers who have not only ceased to be producers, but have taken with them vast quantities of food. It may fairly be doubted if the product of this year, per head, exceeds thirty-eight to forty bushels; and hence it is, in part, that the prices are even thus far maintained. Nevertheless, there is a gradual tendency to a fall of prices, showing a power of consumption diminishing in a greater ratio than that of production.

That the power to obtain food in return to labour diminished greatly between 1835 and 1839 must be within the recollection of all who were familiar with the events of that period. Never has there been experienced in this country so much anxiety relative to the result of the harvest as was felt in 1838. From that time, the tendency to dispersion diminished; and, in 1839 and 1840, labour commanded good supplies of food, as is obvious from the fact that immigration rose, attaining, in 1841-2, the height of 101,000. The value of labour and food had, however, by that time greatly fallen, and,



in 1842, it fell to a lower point than had been known for twenty years, the consequence of which was, a great diminution in the immigration of the two succeeding years. Thence to 1847, the increase was very rapid; but, in the following year, it became stationary, and is now falling rapidly.

We may now proceed to the next great article of food—

## SUGAR.

	Foreign.	Crop of Louisiana.	Total.	Per head.
1821 to 1829 . . . . .	57,000,000	45,000,000	102,000,000	9
1830 . . . . .	96,000,000	48,000,000	144,000,000	11
1831 . . . . .	69,000,000	75,000,000	144,000,000	10½
1832 . . . . .	48,000,000	75,000,000	123,000,000	9
1833 . . . . .	97,000,000	70,000,000	167,000,000	12
1834 . . . . .	115,000,000	75,000,000	190,000,000	13
1835 to 1841, 138,000,000 — ½ .	110,000,000	77,000,000	187,000,000	11½
1842 and 1843 . . . . .	114,000,000	115,000,000	229,000,000	12½
1844 . . . . .	182,000,000	105,000,000	287,000,000	15
1845 . . . . .	114,000,000	200,000,000	314,000,000	16
1846 . . . . .	108,000,000	186,000,000	294,000,000	14¾
1847 . . . . .	232,000,000	146,000,000	372,000,000	18
1848 . . . . .	244,000,000	240,000,000	484,000,000	23
1849 . . . . .	242,000,000	220,000,000	467,000,000	21½

We see here a rapid increase of consumption from 1829 to 1834, and that it then diminished in actual amount until 1844, and that the average of 1846-7 and 1847-8 was but little less than double that of 1842-3. The power to consume foreign sugar has kept steady pace with the increase in the home supply, giving a total consumption for the year 1847-8 exceeding, by more than 150 per cent., that of the period from 1821 to 1829, and almost double that of 1842 and 1843.

The power of producing food thus kept pace with the power to apply labour and capital to the conversion of food and other raw materials into iron, cloth, and other commodities requisite for the use of man; and thus both kept pace with the tendency to the concentration of population. With every increase in the power of production, consumption grew, and the labourer received larger returns for his labour, producing a tendency to immigration. With every diminution in the power of production, the power to pay for foreign commodities diminished, and hence it was that the early years of the approach to freedom of trade were signalized by the creation of a vast debt, the interest on which has now to be paid.

## INTERNAL COMMERCE.

We may now examine how far the power to maintain internal trade waxed or waned with the increased or diminished power of production, for which purpose, I give the TOLLS on the three principal routes between the east and west, and the TONNAGE that passed through the Louisville and Portland Canal. In examining them it will be proper to bear in mind that the receipts from immigrants from Europe, in the last two years, have been prodigious, notwithstanding which there has been a large decrease in the two from which I have been able to obtain complete returns. It follows, of course, that the receipts from merchandise have greatly diminished in their ratio to population. Should immigration continue to fall off, the deficiency in the receipts from these works will become of serious importance to the treasuries of both New York and Pennsylvania.

## TOLLS.

	New York Canal.	Per 1000 of population.	Baltimore and Ohio Railroad.	Per 1000 of population.	Penn. Canals.	P. 1000 of population.	Ton'ge, L. & P. Canal.
1826,	\$844,000	\$73					
1827,	880,000	74					
1828,	829,000	68					
1829,	815,000	65					
1830,	1,042,000	81					
1831,	748,000	56	\$31,000				76,000
1832,	1,112,000	81	137,000	9.9			70,000
1833,	1,388,000	98	196,000	13.9	148,000	10.5	170,000
1834,	1,381,000	95	205,000	14.1	306,000	21.1	162,000
1835,	1,482,000	99	263,000	17.6	679,000	45.4	200,000
1836-41	1,655,000	102	349,000	21.5	1,020,000	60.7	223,000
1842,	1,749,000	97	426,000	23.6	903,000	50.0	172,000
1843,	2,081,000	112	575,000	31.0	1,014,000	55.0	232,000
1844,	2,446,000	128	658,000	34.6	1,164,000	61.5	304,000
1845,	2,646,000	135	718,000	37.7	1,154,000	59.1	318,000
1846,	2,756,000	138	881,000	44.0	1,357,000	68.0	341,000
1847,	3,635,000	177	1,101,000	54.0	1,587,000	78	307,000
1848,	3,252,000	155	1,213,000	60.0	1,550,000	73.3	341,000
1849,	3,266,000	150	1,241,000	57.2	1,580,000	72.4	

The LAKE TONNAGE in 1834 was . . . . . 28,521 tons.

In 1841 it had risen to only . . . . . 56,252

1846 it was . . . . . 106,836

1847, . . . . . 139,399

1848, . . . . . 166,400

We thus see while it increased but 28,000 tons in the first period of seven years, it has gained 110,000 in the last, and nearly all of this since 1843. At the present time there is no tendency to increase. The great support of this trade is found in the transport of immigrants, and any diminution therein must be followed by a diminution in the tonnage.

In 1842, the STEAMBOAT TONNAGE on the western rivers was but 126,278, and the tendency was downward, as the business was very small, as may be seen from the number of trips made by certain boats:—

	Boats.	Trips.		Boats.	Trips.
1839,	35	141	1841,	32	162
1840,	28	147	1842,	29	88

In 1846, only four years afterwards, it had almost doubled, the amount being 249,055. In the two succeeding years it increased rapidly, as may be seen by the following statement of boats built at Cincinnati:—

1845-6, 5657 tons. | 1846-7, 8268 tons. | 1847-8, 10,232 tons.

In the last year the tendency has been downward; the boats built being only 7281 tons; and the number of arrivals being only 3239, against 4007 in the previous year.

We thus meet everywhere the same results. From 1835 to 1843, scarcely any increase; but from that date every thing starts into life and grows with rapidity. Arrived at 1848 and 1849, all tends downwards, notwithstanding the great increase of population.

## TRADE OF NEW ORLEANS.

The value of the principal products of the interior received at New Orleans from 1841-2, to the present time, has been as follows:—

		Total.			Total.
1841-2,	.	\$45,716,045	1845-6,	.	\$77,193,464
1842-3,	.	53,782,084	1846-7,	.	90,033,000
1843-4,	.	60,094,716	1847-8,	.	70,779,000
1844-5,	.	57,166,122	1848-9,	.	81,889,000

The value doubled in six years, but it is now falling, notwithstanding the large increase of western population in the last two years.

## NEW YORK

Being the place supposed to be most benefited by perfect freedom of trade, we may profit by an examination into the effect of the various systems, as exhibited in the number of houses built in that city, as compared with the population of the country, of which it is the commercial capital. The earliest account I have been able to obtain is that of 1834:—

		Houses built.	Per million of population.			Houses built.	Per million of population.
1834,	.	877	60	1845,	.	1980	101
1835-41, average,	.	943*	58	1846,	.	1910	95
1842,	.	912	50	1847,	.	1823	90
1843,	.	1273	69	1848,	.	1191	60
1844,	.	1210	64	1849,	.	1496	68

The rapid extension of Brooklyn has been since 1842. Had it been possible to obtain a similar account of that city, which is but a suburb of New York, the difference would have been much more striking. We have here, however, all that is needed to show that houses in New York grew with the growth of factories and furnaces, and diminished, as they now diminish, with the cessation of their operations.

## PHILADELPHIA.

It is deemed desirable to give the movement of PHILADELPHIA as the distributor of a large portion of the coal and iron of the Union, and as the centre of an important portion of the commerce between the East and the West; but it is impossible to obtain the number of houses built, because of no such record having been preserved, by several of the districts, until quite recently, and to give the movement of the population in the several periods, it is necessary to take the returns under the State censuses, which are septennial, and those made under the authority of the federal government, which are decennial. The former returns give only the number of taxables, but by multiplying them by five the population was always found to be nearly obtained, and I have done so throughout, although it is said that the proportion of non-taxables has within a few years so far increased as to make it necessary to multiply by five and a half. How far that is the case will be determined by the census of next year.

		Taxables.	Population.	Per cent. per annum.	Ratio to population of the Union, in thousands to millions.
1821.	State census	27,892	139,460	.	15.3
1828.	"	37,313	186,565	increase 4.9	15.2
1830.	U. S. "	.	188,958	" .6	14.6
1835.	State "	49,847	249,235	" 6.6	16.7
1840.	U. S. "	.	258,000	" .8	15.1
1842.	State "	51,063	255,315	decrease .5	14.1
* 1849.	" "	77,285	386,425	increase 7.4	17.7

\* Of these the number built in 1835 and 1836, before the Compromise began to have much effect, was greater than in any three of the other years.

It appears obvious that the productive power of the country diminished from 1835 to 1841, and still more rapidly in the two following years; and therefore it was that the power to pay for foreign commodities diminished so much that consumption could be maintained only by obtaining goods on credit, to be paid for at some future time, and bearing interest until paid. The following table will show the VALUE OF EXPORTS, being the amount of merchandise received from abroad in payment for merchandise and freights.

	Value of exports, per head.	Debt contracted.	Debt paid off.
1821, to 1829, aver.,	\$5 . . .	* . . .	
1830, . . . . .	4.32 . . .	. . . . .	
1831, . . . . .	6.10 . . .	. . . . .	
1832, . . . . .	5.51 . . .	. . . . .	
1833, . . . . .	6.20 . . .	. . . . .	
1834, . . . . .	7.08 . . .	. . . . .	
1835 to 1841, aver.,	6.02 . . .	\$170,000,000 . . .	
1842-3, . . . . .	4.48 . . .	Interest unpaid. . . .	
1844, . . . . .	5.03 . . .	. . . . .	Interest.
1845, . . . . .	5.16 . . .	. . . . .	
1846, . . . . .	5.75 . . .	. . . . .	\$5,000,000
1847, . . . . .	7 . . . . .	. . . . .	5,000,000
1848, . . . . .	5.88 . . .	8,000,000 . . . . .	
1849, . . . . .	5.19 . . .	22,000,000 . . . . .	

With each step in the diminution of the power to produce, there is diminished power of purchase, and hence the necessity for obtaining goods on credit. So it was from 1835 to 1841, and the result was almost universal bankruptcy. So is it at present, and the goal towards which we are moving would seem to be the same. The amount now required for the payment of interest is about \$14,000,000 per annum, being \$2,000,000 more than was required for the same purpose two years since.

In the following table are given two species of articles, of one of which (flax) a large part was freed from duty by the Compromise tariff, and so continued until September, 1841, while the other was subject to the same provisions as manufactures of other kinds. It will be seen how small is the difference of movement, proving that the amount of importation depends upon the *power* to import, and is but slightly affected by the question of duty.

	Manufactures of flax.	Per head.	China and earthenware.	Per head.
Sept. 30, 1821-29, average,	\$3,333,000	29 . . . . .	\$1,160,000	10
" " 1830, . . . . .	3,011,000	23½ . . . . .	1,259,000	10
" " 1831, . . . . .	3,790,000	28½ . . . . .	1,624,000	12½
" " 1832, . . . . .	4,073,000	30 . . . . .	2,024,000	15
" " 1833, . . . . .	3,132,000	22 . . . . .	1,818,000	13
" " 1834, . . . . .	5,485,000	38 . . . . .	1,591,000	11
" " 1835-41, \$6,350,000—½=	5,080,000	31 1,950,000—½=	1,560,000	9½
" " 1842 to } average,	2,900,000	15½ . . . . .	1,300,000	7
June 30, 1843, . . . . .				
" " 1844, . . . . .	4,492,000	23½ . . . . .	1,632,000	8½
" " 1845, . . . . .	4,923,000	25 . . . . .	2,166,000	11
" " 1846, . . . . .	4,972,000	25 . . . . .	2,201,000	11½
" " 1847, . . . . .	5,152,000	25 . . . . .	2,320,000	11
" " 1848, \$6,600,000—½=	5,660,000	27 2,600,000—½=	2,228,000	10
" " 1849, 5,700,000—½=	4,750,000	22 2,231,000—½=	1,860,000	8½

\* In 1829, the debt of the Federal Government was \$58,000,000. In the year 1833-4, it was reduced to \$4,000,000, and in the following year to \$37,000. As much of this was held abroad, the amount paid off in this period was probably equal to that of States and corporations transmitted abroad at the same time.



We see here the importation of linens increasing under the tariff of 1828, diminishing from 1835 to 1841, and still further diminishing in the closing years of the Compromise tariff. Thenceforward it rises rapidly, notwithstanding the increasing tendency to substitute manufactures of cotton for those of flax.

In regard to China and earthenware, we see the same course of events. The importation rises under the tariff of 1828, diminishes under the Compromise, and still further diminishes in 1842-3, when it begins to rise under the tariff of 1842, but never attains the same height as in the previous period.

## FRENCH MERCHANDISE.

		Per head.	
1822 to 1829, average, . . . . .	9,130,000	81	Silks subject to duty.
1830, . . . . .	8,240,000	64	"
1831, . . . . .	14,737,000	1.11	"
1832, . . . . .	12,754,000	92	"
1833, . . . . .	13,962,000	1.00	Silks free.
1834, . . . . .	17,557,000	1.21	"
1835 to 1841, average 25,200,000 — $\frac{1}{3}$ , . . . . .	20,160,000	1.24	"
1842 and 1843, average, . . . . .	14,500,000	80	Duties reimposed.
1844, . . . . .	17,952,000	94	"
1845, . . . . .	22,069,000	1.13	"
1846, . . . . .	21,600,000	1.08	"
1847, . . . . .	24,900,000	1.21	"
1848, . . . . . 28,000,000 — $\frac{1}{4}$ , . . . . .	24,000,000	1.14	"
1849, . . . . . 23,233,000 — $\frac{1}{4}$ , . . . . .	19,360,000	90	"

We have here the same results as elsewhere. The commodities we receive from France are almost altogether articles of luxury. In the period between 1829 and 1834, there is a gradual increase, until, in 1834, the consumption exceeds by fifty per cent. the average from 1821 to 1829. Thenceforward the amount remains almost precisely the same until we reach 1841. In the period ending June 30, 1843, it falls to the level of fifteen years before. In the following year, it begins to rise, and, by 1847, attains the level of 1834. In 1848 it falls to \$1.14. In 1849, the amount, *paid for*, falls almost to the level of 1842-3.

The remarkable part of this table is, the small increase produced by the abolition of duty upon silks, and the fact that the import rapidly increased after the duties had been reimposed.

## TEA AND COFFEE.

The following table represents the quantities of tea and coffee retained for consumption rather than the actual consumption of the respective years, and the great irregularity of amount is more apparent than real. It is here shown, that the average consumption of tea in the years 1833 and 1834, the last two years in which the tariff of 1828 was in activity, was greater than that of the ensuing ten years, and that, notwithstanding the great increase of population, it did not rise above that quantity until 1845. Of coffee the consumption per head was little greater from 1835 to 1841 than the average of 1833-34.



	Tea.	Per head.		Coffee.	Per head.
1821 to 1829, average, pounds, 6,000,000		·53	pounds, 24,000,000		2·13
1830, . . . . .	6,800,000	·53	38,300,000		3·00
1831, . . . . .	4,600,000	·35	75,000,000		5·60
1832, . . . . .	8,600,000	·63	36,000,000		2·60
1833, . . . . . (Duty free,)	12,900,000	·91	75,000,000		5·30
1834, . . . . .	13,100,000	90	44,000,000		3·00
1835 to 1841, 12,600,000 — $\frac{1}{2}$ ,	10,080,000	·62	89,000,000 — $\frac{1}{2}$ ,	71,200,000	4·40
1842-1843, . . . . .	13,000,000	·71	107,000,000		5·60
1844, . . . . .	13,000,000	·68	149,000,000		7·85
1845, . . . . .	17,100,000	·88	94,000,000		4·82
1846, . . . . .	16,800,000	·84	124,000,000		6·20
1847, . . . . .	14,200,000	·70	152,000,000		7·25
1848, . . . . .	21,000,000	1·00	145,000,000		6·90
1849 . . . . .	13,213,000	·61	151,000,000		7·00

The great question to be settled is—"Which is the system under which the labourer is enabled to obtain the largest quantity of food, fuel, clothing, machinery of production and transportation—protection or free trade?" The former is denounced as a "war upon labour and capital," and yet it seems clear that the power to consume all those things for which men are willing to labour, and in the production of which other men are willing to invest capital, was greater under the two protective tariffs than at any other period, and that it is now gradually, but certainly, diminishing. Wages are falling, and the result is, a diminution of immigration, and an increasing tendency to emigration, both accompanied by a decrease of productive power, to be followed by a further decline of wages, and a further increase of emigration. Shipping has grown with immigration, and freights have fallen, but, with diminution in the former, the latter must rise, and many of the commodities that we have recently exported will have to remain at home, and thus there will be a diminished power of importation, accompanied by a diminution of the public revenue, the improvement of which was one of the objects proposed in the adoption of the policy of 1846. How the different systems have thus far operated upon the receipts from import duties will be seen by an examination of the following table.

## CUSTOMS REVENUE,

*Derived from the import of Merchandise paid for with our Exports.*

		Per head.
1821 to 1829, average, . . . . .	18,500,000	1·69
1830 to 1834, . . . . .	24,000,000	1·75
1835 to 1841, average, . . . . .	\$17,170,000	
Less one-fifth, for goods bought in exchange for certificates of debt, . . . . .	3,404,300	
	<hr/>	
1842 and 1843, . . . . .	13,736,000	0·84 $\frac{1}{2}$
1843-4, . . . . .	16,400,000	0·90
1844-5, . . . . .	26,183,000	1·38
1845-6, . . . . .	27,528,000	1·41
	<hr/>	
1845-6, . . . . .	26,712,000	
Add duty on \$5,000,000 of debts redeemed, . . . . .	1,500,000	
	<hr/>	
1846-7, . . . . .	28,212,000	1·41
	<hr/>	
1846-7, . . . . .	23,747,000	
Add duty on \$5,000,000 of debts redeemed, . . . . .	1,500,000	
	<hr/>	
1847-8, . . . . .	25,247,000	1·23
	<hr/>	
1847-8, . . . . .	31,757,000	
Deduct duty on the amount of debt created, say \$8,000,000, . . . . .	2,400,000	
	<hr/>	
1848-9, . . . . .	29,357,000	1·40
	<hr/>	
1848-9, . . . . .	28,346,000	
Debt created, \$22,000,000—duty, . . . . .	6,600,000	
	<hr/>	
	21,746,000	1·00

It is here seen, that the importation of duty-paying articles increased so much under the tariff of 1828, that the revenue per head was greater than in the previous period, although the duty on railroad iron and on tea and coffee was abolished in 1832. The case would, however, appear much stronger were allowance made for the movements of specie. The period from 1821 to 1829 was one of great exhaustion, and the exports of specie exceeded the imports by an average of almost one million a year; whereas, the imports of the following period exceeded the exports by an average of five millions a year. The total difference is therefore six millions a year. Had this been imported, as in the previous period, in the form of duty-paying articles, and had the duties on tea and coffee been retained, the revenue would have exceeded two dollars per head.

With the next period, we find a great decrease in the revenue, indicating a diminished power to pay for foreign merchandise, resulting from diminished productiveness in the application of labour at home.

With 1842-3, there is a trifling increase, resulting from the action of the tariff of 1842, which was in operation during the last nine months of this short period.

From June, 1843, to June, 1846, the amount rises to an average of \$1.40, and maintains itself during the first three years of the period. The passage of the act of August, 1846, connected with the warehousing system, tended to reduce the amount received into the treasury in the last year of this period.

With 1848, we find the average maintained, without, however, the increase that might naturally have been looked for in consequence of the great demand for breadstuffs, consequent upon the failure of the potato-crop in Ireland.

In the last year (1848-9), being the second in which the tariff of 1846 was in action, the amount of revenue derived from merchandise *paid for by our exports* has greatly declined.

In comparing the receipts under the tariff of 1842 with those of that of 1828, it is necessary to bear in mind, that, in the latter period, before merchandise could be purchased, there was a sum of ten millions of dollars to be provided for payment of interest on the debt incurred in the free trade one. At thirty per cent., that would have given three millions of dollars, or about fifteen cents per head.

The total amount of interest now to be paid is about fourteen millions of dollars, and this claim must be discharged by our exports before merchandise can be purchased: the consequence of which must be, a great deficiency in future revenue.

With these facts before us, we may now examine the different revenue systems that have been presented for consideration and adoption. By the English school it is held that, as cultivation first commences on the richest soils, agricultural labour is then largely paid, and the diversion of any portion of the population to mechanical pursuits is attended with loss. Observation, however, shows that the first cultivator commences, invariably, on the poorer soils, and that the rich lands of river bottoms, the underlying beds of marl, limestone, &c., are only brought into cultivation at a later period. The English school holds that mechanical labour must necessarily, because of the abundance of fertile land and consequent profitable application of labour, be dearer in a new than in an old country, and that competition can be maintained only by aid of laws restricting importation. It holds that double loss results from such restriction, labour being withdrawn from the profitable pursuit of agriculture to be given to the comparatively unprofitable one of converting agricultural products into the

various commodities required for the use of man: also, that these persons, thus unprofitably employed, are maintained out of taxes imposed upon the consumers of their commodities, and that every dollar paid to the government on the import of articles, in part manufactured at home, is accompanied by the payment of five, ten, fifteen, or twenty dollars paid to a selected class, thus living by taxation imposed on their neighbours for their support. This idea may be found fully carried out in a report of the late Secretary of the Treasury, for 1846. It is there shown, that all the coal consumed in the Union costs the consumer \$1.60 *more* than it would do under a system of free trade, although the average price of all the coal sold at Pittsburgh, Wilkesbarre, Mauch Chunk and Pottsville did not, at that moment, exceed \$1.50.

To relieve the consumer from this double taxation, the English school holds that all duties for revenue should be imposed upon articles that cannot be produced in the country, such as tea, coffee, &c., and that all those that can be produced in it, should be admitted free. Such is the theory that dictated the tariff of 1846, and the subsequent efforts to amend it by the imposition of a duty on tea and coffee.

The other school holds that articles which can be produced at home should be protected, while those which cannot should be admitted free of all duty, and such was the view which prompted the abolition of all duties on tea and coffee, by the act of 1832.

By the working of the two systems, their value is to be judged. In the first eighteen months of the tariff of 1832, tea and coffee were admitted free of duty, with a loss to the revenue of nearly three and a half millions of dollars per annum, to which was to be added a great loss of duty on silks, also free; but the protection of manufactures generally was maintained, and the consumption of foreign merchandise liable to duty continued so great, that the revenue increased more rapidly than the population. In the succeeding period, protection gradually diminished, with a certainty of its total disappearance as the Compromise bill should come fully into action, and the productiveness of labour became so far diminished, that the payment into the Treasury for duties on foreign merchandise fell to an average of less than one-half of what it had been from 1829 to 1834.

With the tariff of 1842, it rose gradually, and with a steady upward tendency; while, as that of 1846 comes into operation, there is a movement directly the reverse.

#### PUBLIC EXPENDITURE.

When men live in connection with each other, they are enabled to protect themselves, and have little need of fleets or armies for their protection. A few officers can then perform the duties incident to the maintenance of government. They then exercise, in a high degree, the power of self-government.

When they are widely separated from each other, they are unable to protect themselves, and have need of fleets and armies for their protection. Many officers are then required for the performance of the duties of government, and the power of self-government is diminished.

With the increase of fleets and armies, and of government officials, the cost of government is increased.

The policy of 1828, and that of 1842, tended, as we have seen, to concentration of population and combination of exertion, and, therefore, to increase in the power of self-government. That of 1833 tended, and that of 1846 tends, as has been seen, to dispersion of population and diminution in the power of combination, and, consequently, to diminution in the power of self-

government. What has been the effect of the two systems on the public expenditure I propose now to show. The true "war upon labour and capital," is that which increases the cost of government, and thus diminishes the power to accumulate capital, to be used in aid of labour. Every step towards diminution in the expenditure for that purpose tends to raise wages; and every one tending towards its increase, tends equally towards diminution in the power of both labourer and capitalist to command the necessities, conveniences, or luxuries of life.

From 1821 to 1829, the total expenditure of the government, exclusive of payments on account of debts previously existing, was \$117,000,000, being an average of . . . . . \$13,000,000

From October, 1829, to October, 1834, the period of the tariff of 1828, the total expenditure, exclusive of such payments, was \$4,000,000, being an average of . . . . . 16,800,000

From October, 1834, to October, 1841, the period of the Compromise, during which we colonized Texas and Oregon, the total expenditure was \$223,000,000. In this period there were no payments on account of the old debt, the whole having been extinguished at the close of 1834. The average of this period of dispersion was . . . . . 31,700,000

From October, 1841, to June 30, 1843, was a period of exhaustion, and the wants of the government were such as precluded expenditure. The average was . . . . . 20,400,000

That of 1843-4 was . . . . . 20,600,000

That of 1844-5, . . . . . 21,400,000

With 1845-6, we recommence the system of dispersion. The occupation of Texas had brought with it war with Mexico, and the expenditure rose to . . . . . 26,800,000

In 1846-7, dispersion increased, and large armies were sent to Mexico for the purpose of compelling the cession of California, the consequence of which was that the expenditure rose to . . . . . 59,400,000

In 1847-8, it was . . . . . 45,000,000  
And a large amount remained unsettled.

In 1848-9, . . . . . 46,798,000

As a necessary consequence of this system, the public debt, which was extinguished under the system of concentration, grew rapidly under that of dispersion, to be again diminished under that of concentration, and now again increased under that of dispersion.

## PUBLIC DEBT.

1821,	\$89,987,428		
1829,	58,421,414	Decrease in eight years,	\$31,566,014
1834,	4,760,082	" five years,	53,661,332
1834-5,	37,733	Extinguished.	.
1841,	6,737,398	Increase in five years,	6,737,398
June 30, 1843,	26,898,958	" two years,	20,161,560
" 1845,	17,093,794	Decrease in two years,	9,805,164
" 1848,	48,526,379	Increase in three years,	31,433,585
" 1849,	64,704,693	" one year,	16,178,314

## CREDIT.

With every step in the diminution of debt, credit grows; with every one in the increase thereof, credit diminishes.

The policy of 1828 increased production and raised wages. The power to



pay for foreign commodities was great, and the revenue was large, the consequence of which was the extinction of the public debt, at the close of 1834. Credit was therefore high.

The policy of 1832-3 diminished production and lowered wages. Credit was high, and we obtained cloth and iron in exchange for certificates of debt; the consequence of which was, that, at the close of 1841, the foreign debt was two hundred millions, much of the interest of which we were unable to pay.

Under the Revenue tariff of 1841-2, public and private revenue almost disappeared, and bankruptcy and repudiation were the necessary consequence.

Under the tariff of 1842, production increased and wages rose. The power to pay for foreign commodities increased, public and private revenue grew, and we commenced to diminish our debt, the consequence of which was the perfect re-establishment of credit.

Under the tariff of 1846, production diminishes and wages have fallen. The power to pay for foreign commodities is diminishing, and we are again buying cloth and iron, and settling for them with certificates of debt, the amount of which transmitted to Europe in the two years ending June 30, 1849, is estimated at thirty millions of dollars; all of which we have, in that time eaten and drunk, and used, but have yet to pay for.

With a view to present at a glance the results obtained by this examination of the policy of the Union, I give the following diagrams, in which the movement under the various systems is distinctly shown.

No. I. gives the nine years from 1821 to 1829, when the tariff of 1828 came into operation.

No. II.—The years of the protective tariff of 1828, from 1829 to 1834.

No. III.—Those of the Compromise tariff, from 1834 to 1841. In this case, it will be observed that I have in all cases deducted from the consumption of imported commodities one-fifth, that being the quantity obtained in exchange for certificates of debt.


No. IV.—This represents the movement under the strictly revenue clauses of the Compromise tariff. In some cases, as will be seen, one year, and in others two years are included in this period. The returns for coal, railroad and canal tolls, &c., are made from the civil year, whereas those connected with commerce are made for the fiscal year ending June 30. The effect of taking one year, is to throw into No. III., the period of the Compromise, one-half portion of this period, and the other portion into No. V., the period of the tariff of 1842.

No. V.—The tariff of 1842.

No. VI.—That of 1846.

In the diagrams representing the movements of iron, coal, cottons and woollens, the consumption is given in two sets of lines; one representing the domestic products consumed, and the other the total quantity. An examination of them will show, that the amount of consumption is dependent upon that of domestic production, and that any deficiency therein is *never* compensated by increase of importation, as it should be, if the theory were true upon which the tariff of 1846 is based.


CONSUMPTION OF IRON, FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC, in pounds per head of the population. (See page 11.)



Railroad iron was exempted from duty in the third year of the second period, and from that time consumption ceased to increase.




CONSUMPTION OF COAL, FOREIGN  
AND DOMESTIC, in tons per  
thousand of population. (See  
page 13.)



CONSUMPTION OF COTTON  
GOODS, FOREIGN AND DOM.  
in pounds per head of the  
population. (See page 15.)


Total,  
Domestic,




CONSUMPTION OF WOOLLENS,  
FOREIGN & DOM., in lbs. per  
head of population. (See p. 17.)

Total,


Domestic, 3½




PRODUCTION OF LEAD, in thou-  
sands of pigs. (See page 18.)




POPULATION, as shown in the  
increase of immigration, in  
thousands. (See page 18.)




SHIPPING BUILT, in tons, per thousand of population. (See page 19.)



COMPARATIVE VIEW OF THE MOVEMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND SHIPPING, in thousands. (See page 19.)




NUMBER OF STEAMERS BUILT, per million of population. (See page 19.)




DEPOPULATION, as shown in the occupation of PUBLIC LANDS, as compared with immigration. (See page 20.)




PRODUCTION OF GRAIN, in bushels per head of population. (See page 21.)



PRODUCTION AND CONSUMPTION OF SUGAR, FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC, in pounds per head of population. (See page 23.)



TOLLS ON THE NEW YORK CANALS in dollars per thousand of population. (See page 24.)



TOLLS ON PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC WORKS, in dollars per thousand of population. (See page 24.)




TOLLS ON BALTIMORE AND OHIO RAILROAD, in dollars per thousand of population. (See page 24.)




TRADE ON LOUISVILLE AND PORTLAND CANAL, in thousands of tons (See page 24.)



LAKE TONNAGE, in thousands of tons. (See page 24.)



WESTERN STEAMBOAT TONNAGE, in thousands of tons. (See page 24.)




VALUE OF PRODUCE RECEIVED AT NEW ORLEANS, in millions of dollars. (See page 25.)



HOUSES BUILT IN NEW YORK, per million of population. (See page 25.)




POPULATION OF PHILADELPHIA, in thousands.



RATIO OF PHILADELPHIA TO THE POPULATION OF THE UNION, in thousands to millions. (See page 25.)



VALUE OF EXPORTS, per head of population in dollars. (See page 25.)






I. II. III. IV. V. VI.



FOREIGN DEBT, in millions of dollars. (See page 25.)

IMPORTS OF FOREIGN WOOLLENS,  
paid for by our exports, in cents  
per head of the population.  
(See page 16.)



IMPORTS OF FOREIGN COTTON  
GOODS, paid for by our exports,  
in cents per head of the popula-  
tion. (See page 15.)



Of the four next following, the first two, French Merchandise and Manufactures of flax, were in a great degree freed from duty in 1832, silks and linens being declared absolutely free. The duty was reimposed in 1841. The others, Tea and Coffee, were free from duty in 1832, and so remain. The first two are given chiefly for the purpose of showing how small is the increase of consumption consequent upon a remission of duty, compared with that which, in every case, we have seen to follow the production of a commodity at home.


FRENCH MERCHANDISE, paid for  
in cents per head of the popula-  
tion. (See page 26.)



MANUFACTURES OF FLAX, in  
cents per head of the popula-  
tion. (See page 26.)



CONSUMPTION OF TEA, in hun-  
dredths of pounds per head of  
the population. (See page  
27.)







CONSUMPTION OF COFFEE, in  
pounds per head of the popu-  
lation. (See page 27.)




REVENUE FROM CUSTOMS, in  
cents per head of the popula-  
tion. (See page 28.)



1821—29    1830    1835    1842    1846  
—34    —41    —45    —49




PUBLIC EXPENDITURE, in mil-  
lions of dollars. (See page  
30.)



PUBLIC DEBT, in millions of  
dollars. (See page 31.)

NATIONAL CREDIT, in millions  
of dollars. (See page 31.)



NATIONAL

CREDIT.

POWER  
TO  
MAINTAIN  
EXTERNAL  
COMMERCE.

VALUE  
OF  
EXPORTS.

EDUCATION.


GROWTH  
OF  
NEW YORK.

TOLLS  
ON  
NEW YORK  
CANALS


LAKE  
SHIPPING




WOOLLENS.



POWER  
TO  
OBTAIN FOOD  
AND  
CLOTHING  
IN  
EXCHANGE  
FOR  
LABOUR.




SUGAR.




IRON.


COTTONS.



GRAIN.



COAL.



## CHAPTER FOURTH.

## HOW PROTECTION TENDS TO INCREASE PRODUCTION AND CONSUMPTION.

Two systems are before the world: on the one hand, that which is denominated protection, and on the other that which is denominated free-trade. Each claims to be the one under which the labourer receives the largest reward for his exertions, and it is for the purpose of testing the validity of those claims that I have given the numerous tables contained in the last chapter, by aid of which I now propose to examine this question in its bearings on the various portions of society. It is the great one for the Union, for *in it are included all others*. The discord now existing between the North and the South has its origin in the diminished value of the returns to slave labour. If it can be shown that by one and the same system the interests of the North and the South, the free and the enslaved, can be promoted, harmony may take the place of discord. The differences in regard to internal improvements by aid of the general government have their origin in a necessity for scattering ourselves prematurely over large surfaces. If it can be shown that by one and the same system the North, the South, the East, and the West, can be enriched, and all enabled to make roads for themselves, harmony may be restored. The discords so frequently existing between the employer and the employed, the capitalist and the labourer, the banker and his customers, may all, as I think, be traced to one and the same cause, and if that can be removed, harmony and good feeling may be restored and maintained. Every question affecting the peace and tranquillity of the Union, or the people of the Union, will be settled whenever we shall have determined for ourselves the one great question—"Which is the system under which the labourer obtains the largest reward for his labour?" When that shall come to be done, it will be seen that there is a perfect harmony of interests throughout the Union, and among all its people.

Before proceeding further, I would urge upon the reader a careful examination of those tables, bearing always in mind the precise position of the question that is to be discussed. It is *admitted* by all that protection tends to increase the domestic production of the commodity protected. That, therefore, does not require to be proved. It is *asserted* that protection tends to raise the price of the protected article and to diminish the power of consuming it, whereas the removal of protection diminishes its cost and increases the power of consumption. That is denied, and *that it is which requires to be proved*. If this assertion be true, then the power of consumption must diminish with protection. We see, however, that the consumption of iron, of coal, of cotton, and of wool, increased with great rapidity in the years between 1830 and 1834, and in those from 1843 to 1847. If it be true, the quantity of men and things passing on the roads and canals, and the number of exchanges to be performed in our cities, should diminish with protection,



whereas they increased with great rapidity in both of the above-named periods. If it be true, then it must reduce the wages of labour, and thus diminish the inducements for foreigners to come among us and occupy our vacant lands, whereas immigration increased with great rapidity under both protective tariffs. If it be true, then it must diminish our power to trade with foreign nations, and the inducements to build ships, whereas shipping grew with great rapidity in both those periods.

If, now, we examine the period between 1834 and 1843, it is impossible to avoid being struck with the fact that the power to consume foreign products not only did not increase as domestic production diminished with the approach to free trade, but that it was actually less in quantity than under the system of protection. The building of furnaces and rolling-mills was stopped, yet we consumed less foreign iron than before. So was it with cotton goods, the import of which fell from above *fifty* millions of yards down to *eight* millions. We killed off our sheep, but the importation of foreign cloth diminished. We prevented increase in the domestic consumption of cotton, but shipping did not grow with the increased necessity for depending on foreign markets. We adopted a course that we were assured would raise the wages of labour, but immigration ceased to grow. So is it now. The building of cotton-mills is stopped, but our whole import of last year, in which we incurred a debt of twenty-two millions, but little exceeded a pound per head. We have closed furnaces and rolling-mills, but we consume far less iron than before. We have abolished the system that was regarded as "a war upon labour and capital," yet immigration is diminishing and there is no demand for capital. Steam-engines are idle, and there is no demand for new ones, except for a few steam-vessels. Railroad tolls are diminishing, and steam-boats on the Western waters are idle. Iron is low in price, but it is not wanted. So is coal. So are cottons and woollens. So is almost every description of merchandise. The power of consumption is diminishing, because the demand for labour and capital has largely diminished.

The power of the people to pay taxes for the support of government is dependent upon their power to consume commodities that are taxed, and if protection diminished wages, it must of course diminish revenue; but when we examine the facts, it is shown that, notwithstanding a great increase of the free-list, the revenue increased under the tariff of 1828, and fell off so much afterwards that the government was compelled almost to beg for loans in the markets of Europe. With the tariff of 1842 it grew rapidly, but with that of 1846 it is diminishing in actual amount per head, notwithstanding the purchase of more than twenty millions of goods on credit in a single year. If that debt were now called for, the revenue of the current year would not exceed that of 1842.

The question to be settled is—"Does the power to import grow with the diminution in the power to produce that follows the withdrawal of protection?" If it does, the facts must prove it. There is no question that the power to produce iron and cloth grows with protection. That is, as I have already said, admitted by all. Were it not, the facts prove it. The burden of proof lies, then, with the opponents of protection. To establish their system they must show that the power of production and consumption grows now as it grew three years since, and that it grew from 1835 to 1843 as it grew from 1830 to 1834.

The first thing that must strike all who examine the tables in the last chapter is the universally diminutive amount of foreign products received in exchange for the vast bulk of cotton, grain, provisions, &c., sent to foreign countries. Thus in 1842-'43 the import of cotton cloth was much less than a yard per head of the population, and less probably than one-fourth of a

pound of cotton. In other years we see that it has varied from two to four yards, but in no single year has our consumption of cotton that has passed through foreign looms materially exceeded a pound per head.

The returns from Europe received for all our products may be summed up nearly as follows: fifty cents' worth of iron, half a pound of wool, about as much flax, one or two ounces of silk, and China and earthenware equivalent to a tolerable cup and saucer, to which may be added the *twisting and weaving* of a pound and a half of cotton, per head. To obtain all this we give a large portion of the land and labour of the cotton-growing States, and of those employed in raising tobacco and rice, together with as much food as would feed men, women, and children who could twist and weave five times the cotton, wool, silk, and flax we import, and the use of more capital in horses, wagons, railroads, engines and cars, steam and canal boats, ships, wharves and warehouses, than would be necessary for machinery to convert all our cotton into cloth, and make more iron than has ever been made in Britain, and almost as much labour as would do the work—and *withal, we are brought in debt*. It is certainly using great means for the accomplishment of small ends.

Every portion of the tables tends to prove that while the amount of foreign commodities received in payment for our exports increased in the period from 1829 to 1834, it diminished in that from 1835 to 1841—still further diminished in the years 1842 and 1843, and then rose rapidly from 1844 to 1847, since which time it has declined. These facts seem to warrant the conclusion that the ability to consume foreign products, by both labourer and capitalist, increased under the two tariffs of protection, and declined with every approach to free trade. If, now, we desire to understand how such should be the case, it may be useful to examine how it is with individuals, and, doing so, we shall find that the man who produces most largely of the articles of prime necessity is always the one who can indulge most freely in the luxuries of life; and *vice versa*, that the farmer who obtains from his land the least food, is the one who can least indulge in clothing, coffee, tea, or books.

What is further to be remarked is, that any material increase in the consumption of foreign products, consequent upon the approach to freedom of trade, has appeared to be followed by exhaustion and bankruptcy, while every increase in production at home, consequent upon protection, has been but the preparation for a new and larger increase—sometimes so great as to cause a feeling of apprehension that it was unnatural, and could not be maintained. To what extent this could be carried has never been ascertained, for the only two periods of perfect protection have each been limited to four years. To understand the cause of this, it would be well for the inquirer to examine for himself the facts that become obvious to sight, whenever and wherever a factory or furnace has recently been set in operation. Those presented at Graniteville, S. C., are thus described by a highly intelligent correspondent of "The New York Herald:"—

"The effect of the erection of this manufactory in the neighbourhood is almost magical. Hundreds have found employment among the poor of the white inhabitants, who were, before, almost destitute. A Methodist and a Baptist church have been erected. A free school has been opened, and about 70 pupils attend. There is a large and convenient hotel, where I am writing this letter. The town is laid out in streets, and already over 80 dwelling-houses, very neat and comfortable, with gardens attached, have been put up, which rent from \$16 to \$25 per annum. The girls in the factory are, some of them, very pretty, and are well dressed; and, from what I can learn, the change in their appearance is extraordinary. The superintendent, Mr. George Kelly, who came out here and placed the factory in operation, went with me through the manufactory and town. He informed me that he only brought with him four or five experienced persons from the

North—all the rest in the factory, about 300, men, women, and children, are from the Sand Hills and immediate vicinity, where they, one year ago, were earning nothing. They make now from four to five dollars, (males,) females from three to four dollars, and children one to two dollars per week. Some of the girls, who are now well dressed and appear very intelligent, a year ago were at work in the field, hoeing corn, or ploughing with a horse; others were idle; now they reside in comfortable boarding-houses, where they pay \$1.50 per week for board, and can lay up money. Their education is attended to, and they are on the road to become useful and productive citizens. In fact, since Christmas, over forty marriages have taken place between the young male and female operatives in the factory. They were brought together in it, became attached, and got married. In such a case, the wife generally leaves the factory to attend to the house-keeping arrangements of the new couple, and the husband continues in the factory, which gives them an independent support.

"The grounds around the factory are laid out with a great deal of taste, and I have not seen, in a long while, a more prosperous and thriving place. New houses are going up every week. The applications for work are double what they can possibly employ. They could obtain, in the district, 400 male and female operators, who are without any work, if they could give them employment."

The following account by Mr. Bryant, Editor of "The Evening Post," is descriptive of facts presented by a mill recently erected in Barnwell District, S. C.:—

"The girls of various ages, who are employed at the spindles, had, for the most part, a sallow, sickly complexion, and in many of their faces I remarked that look of mingled distrust and dejection which often accompanies the condition of extreme, hopeless poverty. 'These poor girls,' said one of our party, 'think themselves extremely fortunate to be employed here, and accept work gladly. They come from the most barren parts of Carolina and Georgia, where their families live wretchedly, for hitherto there has been no manual occupation provided for them, from which they do not shrink as disgraceful, on account of its being the occupation of slaves. In these factories, negroes are not employed as operatives, and this gives the calling of the factory girl a certain dignity. You would be surprised to see the change which a short time effects in these poor people. They come bare-footed, dirty, and in rags; they are scoured, put into shoes and stockings, set at work, and sent regularly to Sunday-school, where they are taught what none of them have been taught before—to read and write. In a short time, they become expert at their work; they lose their sullen shyness, and their physiognomy becomes comparatively open and cheerful. Their families are relieved from the temptations to theft and other shameful courses which accompany the condition of poverty without occupation.'"

He adds that "at Graniteville, in South Carolina, about ten miles from the Savannah river, a little manufacturing village has lately been built up, where the families of the *crackers*, as they are called, reclaimed from their idle lives in the woods, are settled and white labour only is employed. The enterprise is said to be in a most prosperous condition."

"The buildings are erected here more cheaply," he continued; "there is far less expense in fuel, and the wages of the work-people are less. At first, the boys and girls of the 'cracker' families were engaged for little more than their board; their wages are now better, but they are still low. I am about to go to the North, and I shall do my best to persuade some of my friends, who have been almost ruined by this Southern competition, to come to Augusta and set up cotton mills."

The labour employed in building these mills was clear profit. The men and their families were there, and they had to be supported by somebody, whether they worked or not. All the labour employed in working the mills is profit. The people have begun to produce. From unproductive consumers they have become productive consumers. In their former condition they could consume scarcely any clothing, or utensils requiring iron for their manufacture, or furniture, or books, or newspapers—scarcely any thing, indeed, but food. Having become productive, *the whole surplus* may go to the purchase of other things than food, and thus is made a market for cloth and iron and other commodities, that before had no existence. *Every producer is a consumer to the whole extent of his production*, and by enabling these poor people to produce more, the planter



makes a market on the land for the products of the land, to the extent of the whole excess of production. The more that is produced, the more *must* be consumed.

This assertion may at first appear to be one of doubtful truth, yet a little examination will, I think, suffice to establish its perfect correctness. The man who earns six dollars a week, lays by one of them, which he carries to the saving-fund, which lends it and other similar dollars to some one who desires to build a house. He pays it out to workmen who purchase with it food and clothing, and thus is that surplus dollar consumed. The capitalist, with his savings, builds houses, or ships, or factories, and the workmen whom he employs purchase food and clothing, and the use of houses, with his money. The average consumption of a year always is *and must be* equal to the average production, and if we desire to know the extent of the one we have but to ascertain that of the other.

In 1839 we imported forty-three millions of yards of cotton cloths of various kinds, the consumers of which were customers to the planter to the extent of eleven millions of pounds of cotton, or less than 28,000 bales, being as much as would be worked up by twenty-eight mills of moderate size, or fourteen of larger size. To produce these mills in any single cotton-growing State would require no effort whatsoever, and when produced it would be found that they would be all profit, for it would be attended with not the slightest diminution in the amount of agricultural production. The labourers are there, and a large portion of their time is absolutely waste. The horses and wagons are there, to a great extent unemployed. The timber is there, encumbering the best lands of the plantation. The men and the horses must be fed, and the wagons must be kept in order. Make a market for this waste labour, and the labourers will consume more food, but the chief increase of expenditures will be in clothing, thus making a market for cotton—in houses, making a market for stone and lumber—in furniture, for which lumber will be required—in books and newspapers, making a market for rags—and the cloth-makers, and carpenters, and masons, and cabinet-makers, and paper-makers, and printers, will want cloth, and shoes, and houses, making a further market for cotton and leather, and lumber and stone. Exchanging thus on the spot, each and every man would be a producer, whereas when exchanges are made at great distances, the transporters and exchangers are more numerous than the producers, and as consumption *must* go to the extent of production, and *can* go no further, we may now see why it is that consumption tends to increase so rapidly when men work in combination with each other.

In four years we erected mills that worked up 300,000 bales of cotton, or eleven times as much as was contained in all the cloth imported in 1839. To have created treble that number would have required no effort, nor would it have been attended with any loss of agricultural products, for the labour was being wasted in every county of the South and West: and to carry them on would now be attended with no diminution in the product of food or cotton, for treble the labour required for a factory is now being wasted in almost every county of the Union, and in *every one* south of New England. To the labour-power of men and horses, and women and children, now absolutely unemployed, let us add the quantity that is wasted on the road, and to that let us add the manure now wasted on the road, and then we may form an estimate, but even then a very insufficient one, of the increased product that would have resulted from the creation of these mills. Let us then reflect that all these people are now fed, and that their surplus earnings would be applicable to the purchase of other things than food, and we may then see what would be the extent of the market thus made on the land for the products of the land.



A great error exists in the impression now very commonly entertained in regard to national division of labour, and which owes its origin to the English school of political economists, whose system is throughout based upon the idea of making England "the workshop of the world," than which nothing could be less natural. By that school it is taught that some nations are fitted for manufactures and others for the labours of agriculture, and that the latter are largely benefited by being compelled to employ themselves in the one pursuit, making all their exchanges at a distance, thus contributing their share to the maintenance of the system of "ships, colonies, and commerce." The whole basis of their system is *conversion* and *exchange*, and not production, yet neither makes any addition to the amount of things to be exchanged. It is the great boast of their system that the exchangers are so numerous and the producers so few,\* and the more rapid the increase in the proportion which the former bear to the latter, the more rapid is supposed to be the advance towards perfect prosperity. Converters and exchangers, however, must live, and they must live out of the labour of others: and if three, five, or ten persons are to live on the product of one, it must follow that all will obtain but a small allowance of the necessities or comforts of life, as is seen to be the case. The agricultural labourer of England often receives but seven shillings a week, being the price of a bushel and a half of wheat.

Were it asserted that some nations were fitted to be growers of wheat and others grinders of it, or that some were fitted for cutting down trees and others for sawing them into lumber, it would be regarded as the height of absurdity, yet it would not be more absurd than that which is daily asserted in regard to the conversion of cotton into cloth, and implicitly believed by tens of thousands even of our countrymen. The loom is as appropriate and necessary an aid to the labours of the planter as is the grist-mill to those of the farmer. The furnace is as necessary and as appropriate an aid to the labours of both planter and farmer as is the saw-mill, and those who are compelled to dispense with the proximity of the producer of iron, labour to as much disadvantage as do those who are unable to obtain the aid of the saw-mill and the miller. The loom and the anvil are, like the plough and the harrow, but small machines, naturally attracted by the great machine, the earth, and when so attracted all work together in harmony, and men become rich, and prosperous, and happy. When, on the contrary, from any disturbing cause, the attraction is in the opposite direction, and the small machines are enabled to compel the products of the great machine to follow them, the land invariably becomes poor, and men become poor and miserable, as is the case with Ireland.

To those who doubt the extent of the loss resulting from this unnatural division of labour, I would recommend a visit to any farm at a distance of thirty or forty miles from a furnace or a factory, that they may there, on the ground, satisfy themselves of the fact. They will there see days perpetually wasted for want of means of occupation—and other days on the road carrying to market small amounts of produce—and general listlessness resulting from the want of stimulus to activity, on the part of the men, while children, male and female, are totally unemployed, and the schoolmaster remains abroad for want of means to pay him when at home. As a general rule,

---

\* "Out of 3,400,000 families in Great Britain in 1831, but 960,000 were engaged in agriculture, the work of production. Between 1831 and 1841 the number of adult males increased 630,000, but the number of those employed in agriculture diminished 19,000. The town population, that which lives by the work of conversion and exchange, is steadily increasing in its ratio to the producing population, and as a necessary consequence there is a steady increase of poverty, vice, and crime.

our farmers attach scarcely any value to time. They go to a distant market in preference to selling at a nearer one, when the difference of price to be obtained upon their few pounds of butter, or baskets of vegetables, appears utterly insignificant compared with the loss of time and labour, and they do this because labour is to so great an extent totally valueless. Let the inquirer look to these things for himself, and let him then add the enormous proportion of the labour that is misemployed in badly cultivating large surfaces instead of small ones—in keeping up fences and roads entirely disproportioned to the product of the land—and finally let him add the waste of intellect from the want of proper instruction and frequent communication with their neighbour men—and then let him determine if the loss is not *five times over* as great as would pay for all the cloth and iron—raw material included—consumed upon the farm. Place the mill there, and all this is saved. The farmer and his horses and wagon are employed in hauling stone and timber for the mill and for houses, and his children find employment in the mill, or in the production of things that can be used by those who work in the mill, and *all* their extra earnings may go for cloth and iron, *for food they had before*. I say all, for with the mill come improved roads, and the facility of sending to market the many things for which a market on the land cannot as yet be made.

The mill and furnace, and the coal mine, are saving-funds, in which the people of the neighbourhood deposit the labour and the things which otherwise would be waste, and where these depositories exist, farmers and planters become rich. Where they do not, they remain poor. To those who desire to understand the wonderful effect of the daily deposit of small quantities of labour, I would recommend an examination of the saving-fund system of Europe and this country. They will there see how much can be accumulated from small savings when a safe place of deposit is offered, and thence can form a judgment of how much is liable to be wasted for want of such institutions. The people of New England have saving-funds in which they deposit what would be otherwise the waste labour of themselves, their horses and wagons, their sons and their daughters, and much of the produce that would otherwise be wasted, making by the very act a market on the land for the products of the land, and thus are enabled to save the manure, and they grow rich because of these economies. The people of other States waste labour, and water-power, and produce of various kinds, and then they destroy their timber for want of a market for it, and they waste their manure, and thus it is that they remain poor because of this extravagance. One cent per day for each person of the nation is almost eighty millions of dollars in a year. Is there not wasted, for want of a demand for it, labour to quintuple that sum per head? If so, the amount is four hundred millions of dollars, or forty times the price—raw material included—of all the cotton cloths we can afford to buy from abroad.

Were all this saved, it would make a market for four hundred millions of dollars of cottons and woollens, of linens, iron, hardware, agricultural implements, coal, and all of the thousand other things required for the comfort and enjoyment of life. I say four hundred millions of those things, for food they had before, and as they are all consumers to the whole extent of their production, they must expend almost the whole extra production in other things than food. To the extent of these four hundred millions they would be customers to the land and its owner, for the earth is the sole producer.

Should the inquirer desire to view the effect of this waste of labour, on a large scale, he could not now do better than visit the valley of the Schuylkill. Doing so, he would find there all the labour and all the machine-power requisite for the production at market of 60,000 tons of coal per week,

worth about \$240,000. The quantity that will go to market this year will be about 30,000 tons per week, worth \$120,000. Here is a diminution in the article of coal alone, to the extent of six millions of dollars, and if we were to add the loss from iron it would increase greatly the amount. Having ascertained this, if he should then inquire what was being produced to make amends for this, he would find it literally nothing. The men are there, and their wives and families are there, and they must have food, and that they may obtain it hundreds and thousands are cultivating potato patches; but the whole value produced to take the place of the coal and iron not produced, is so small as scarcely to be worth the slightest notice.

The labour-power now being wasted in that valley is more than would pay for all the iron and coal we have imported, and for which we have to pay in wheat or cotton. If, now, we follow this six millions, we can find it everywhere diminishing the power of the labourer and the miner to consume food or cloth, to the loss of both farmer and planter—diminishing the demand for the labour, and consequently the reward of the labourer and of the mechanic—diminishing the power of railroad owners to construct new roads, and thus again diminishing the demand for labour, and the power to pay for cloth or food: and thus may it be traced, step by step, throughout the whole nation, every interest taking its share of the loss.

Let the inquirer next visit a factory of any kind, and he will see that the whole value of the labour there employed is a creation that owes its existence to the fact that the mill has been built to be a saving-fund in which each family may deposit the labour, physical and mental, that would otherwise be wasted, receiving in exchange the cloth, the hats and coats, the shoes and stockings, the books and newspapers, that could not otherwise have been obtained. Let him then trace these savings, and he will find them producing an increased demand for food—and better food—a demand for cotton, and wool, and iron, and fuel, and all other of the products of the earth, to the benefit of every owner or cultivator of land, whether farmer or planter.

The people of New England save labour, and doing so they grow rich, and are enabled to make roads by which they travel rapidly to market, and they save the refuse of their products, which goes back upon the land, and that also grows rich. The people of the South and West, for want of such labour-saving-funds, waste more time than would pay *many times over* for all the cloth and iron they can consume; and then they are unable to make roads, the consequence of which is that the conveyance to market is costly. They have to go to a distance for the performance of every exchange, however small. Their *necessities* for making roads are great, but their *power* to make roads is small. They waste all the refuse of their land, which is exhausted, and then they run away to other lands, *increasing their necessities and diminishing their power*.

But, it is asked, cannot too much coal and iron, cotton, wheat, and other of the good things of the world be produced—more than can be consumed? Those who ask this question do not recollect that every man is a consumer to the whole extent of his production. The more coal and iron are produced, the more wheat and cotton are consumed. The more wheat and cotton are produced, the more coal and iron are consumed. Consumption and production go hand in hand, and when there is a glut of any thing it is the result of error in the system that requires to be corrected.

Coal is now superabundant. The market is overloaded with a quantity smaller than that which was readily consumed two years since, and less by one-third than would be now required, had the power of consumption increased at the same rate as during the period from 1843 to 1847. The friends of the existing system point to the trivial import of foreign coal, and



say that the cause of diminished product cannot there be found. They are right, but in so saying they condemn the system. The duty on coal was reduced in order that the labourer might obtain fuel more readily, but it has become so much more difficult to procure it that the consumption is already sensibly diminished, with every prospect of a further diminution. The total import of iron, and of cotton cloth, is as nothing compared with the growth of the product in the years from 1843 to 1847, and thus we see that the supply diminishes instead of increasing in its ratio to population, under a system that was to enable the labourer, and the farmer and planter, more readily to obtain cloth and iron.

It is not so much that coal needs protection for itself—or that iron or cotton need it for themselves—but that each needs it for the other. The producer of coal suffers because the furnace is closed, and the producer of iron suffers because the factories are no longer built, and the maker of cloth suffers because labour is everywhere being wasted, and the power to buy cloth is diminished. The harmony of interests—agricultural and manufacturing—is as perfect as is that of the movements of a watch, and no one can suffer without producing injury among all around. The grower of cotton suffers when the operatives in cotton factories and the workers in mines and furnaces are unemployed, and the latter suffer when adverse circumstances diminish the return to the labour of the farmer and planter.

There are more labour and the products of labour wasted in the States south of Mason and Dixon's line, than would, *ten times over*, convert into cloth all the cotton they produce, and more in the States north of it, than would, *ten times over*, produce all the iron made in Great Britain. This may appear a large statement, yet it is less than the truth, as will be clearly seen on examination. If evidence of this be desired, look to the fact that the manufacture of cottons and woollens doubled in five years—and that of iron, which in 1843 was under 250,000 tons, reached nearly 800,000 in 1847. Did this diminish the products of agriculture? Was not, on the contrary, the supply greater than was ever before known? We added at least two hundred millions in manufactures, not only without diminution elsewhere, but with a larger increase than had ever before taken place, and it was precisely when the home consumption had become so immense that the assertion was made that we had three hundred millions of bushels of food for which we needed a market. All this labour was saved labour, and much of the things employed would otherwise have been wasted.

Look next to the other fact, that it was *precisely when the growth of manufactures was arrested*, from 1835 to 1839, that the supply of food became so short that, notwithstanding diminished consumption consequent upon high prices, we were compelled to import wheat to the amount of more than four millions of dollars in a single year, and it will be seen if the experience of the two periods—1835-'41, and 1844-'47—does not prove conclusively that the nearer the loom and the anvil are brought to the plough, the larger is the return to the labours of the ploughman. Could it be otherwise? The nearer the place of exchange, the less of labour and manure are wasted on the road, and the more uninterruptedly is labour applied, upon a machine constantly increasing in its powers. The demand for lumber enables the farmer to sell his trees, and with the product he drains his land, and thus is enabled to cultivate more and better land. The more distant the loom and the anvil, the more labour and manure are wasted on the road, the less of both can be given to the land, and the best lands necessarily remain encumbered with trees that are valueless, because the labour of clearing them is more than they are worth when cleared.

That the reward of the labourer advances under the protective system is



obvious from the fact that immigration increases. Men go from low wages to seek high ones. From 1829 to 1834 immigration grew. Thence to 1843 it was almost stationary. Thence to the present time it has increased with vast rapidity. Henceforward, if the existing system be maintained, it must diminish, for the power to obtain food and clothing, fuel and house-room, wages, has declined.

That the productiveness of labour increases is obvious from the rapid growth of canal and railroad tolls, and their stationary condition with every approach to the policy that tends to the separation of the loom and the anvil from the plough and the harrow. So again with the growth of steamboats, and of vessels generally. The more there is produced, the more can be consumed, and the more will go to market.

There is, as it appears to me, no single point of view from which we regard the facts now passing before our eyes, in which we shall not find confirmation of the correctness of these views. Were all the machinery now used in Lowell and Providence, for the manufacture of coarse cloths, taken out and replaced by that fitted for making fine cloths, and muslins, and silks, the product would be ten times as much as we now import, with little increase in the quantity of labour employed. Were all that coarse machinery then distributed throughout the South, it would enable the people of Southern States to convert into cloth three hundred thousand additional bales of cotton, not only without diminution in the agricultural export, but with an increase, for labour would then be more advantageously applied. To accomplish all this, by building mills and making machinery, would require an amount of labour equal to but a very small portion of that which is now wasted in a single year, and *not as much as is this year wasted in Pennsylvania alone.*

The people of the North would then have called into action a higher degree of intellect than is now required, and wages would rise, and the consumption of woollen and cotton cloth, of silks, and of sugar, and tea, and coffee, would grow rapidly. The people of the South would find the same effects. Their own consumption of cotton would be quintupled, while they would consume more and better food than now. They would need better houses, and the demand for timber and stone would clear their land, and wealth and population would give them better roads, and the men who came to make roads would eat food and wear coarse cottons, and thus the planters themselves would be enabled to become large customers for the fine ones produced in the North.

Consuming more tea and coffee, the producers of those articles would be able to purchase more cotton, and thus the planters' market would grow on every hand. The demand for machinery, for furniture, and for thousands of other things, would produce new improvements in manufactures, and the producers of tea and coffee, sugar and cotton, would be enabled to consume more largely of them, while the makers of machinery and furniture would need more iron, more lumber, and more cotton.\*

---

\* I take the following from *The Cincinnati Gazette*, as evidence of the vast amount of smaller articles, composed of things that would be wasted, and prepared, much of it, by labour that would be wasted but for the proximity of a market:—

“What our larger manufactures for the South are, is well understood, especially by persons familiar with the machinery of sugar plantations. Our small manufactures, consisting of bagging, buckets, tubs, ploughs, &c., are less known. The exports of some of these for four seasons, will serve to show both the requirements of the South in this respect, and our ability to supply them.

On the other hand, let us suppose the cotton mills closed, and the supply of cloth diminished to the extent of all that is produced from 600,000 bales of cotton—the furnaces closed, and the supply of iron diminished to the extent of 800,000 tons—and the coal mines closed, and the supply of fuel diminished to the extent of three millions of tons—could we import and pay for the deficiency? Would the whole cotton crop then bring more than we now obtain for three-fourths of it? It would not. Our power to import foreign cloth and iron, and fuel, would not only not be increased, but *it would be diminished*, and we should consume one pound of cotton per head instead of ten or twelve. The power to pay for all the cotton and iron produced at home, results from the saving of labour, and with the disappearance of the power to save that labour would disappear the power to consume what are now its products. Union between the producer and the consumer at home, would, therefore, appear to be more profitable than union with people abroad and disunion among those at home.

## CHAPTER FIFTH.

## WHY IS IT THAT PROTECTION IS REQUIRED?

If all the labour employed in converting food and cotton into cloth, and food, ore, and fuel into iron, be really saved labour—if the whole result be really profit—why is it that men should require protection to enable them to produce cloth and iron? The question is a natural one, and should be fully answered.

It is because it is saved labour, and because the loom and the anvil are merely subsidiary to the plough and the harrow that protection is required. The first and great object of man is, to obtain food and the materials of clothing for himself and family. Neither is fit for use in the form in which it is yielded by the earth—the great machine of production. The grain requires to be ground, and the wool to be spun and woven. He pounds the one and his wife endeavours to convert the other into cloth of some description, however rude. They work with bad machinery, and they lose much time, and yet the loss is less than would be the case were they to carry the grain to the distant flour-mill, or the wool to the yet more distant woollens-mill. By degrees population increases, and the blacksmith comes to exchange horse-shoes for food. The carpenter comes to exchange labour for food. The saw-miller comes to exchange the labour of himself and his

	1845-'46.	1846-'47.	1847-'48.	1848-'49.
Alcohol, bbls. . . . .	1,615	1,844	1,771	3,022
Brooms, doz. . . . .	1,584	5,108	3,760	3,333
Bagging, pieces . . . . .		8,867	12,632	15,910
Candles, boxes . . . . .	6,757	16,622	29,180	39,640
Cooperage, pieces . . . . .	18,388	41,121	36,924	55,617
Lard oil, bbls. . . . .	1,690	6,199	8,277	9,550
Linseed oil, bbls. . . . .	455	6,032	3,878	3,020
Soap, boxes . . . . .	2,708	10,080	11,295	11,308
Starch, boxes . . . . .	2,499	5,826	8,179	7,904
White lead, kegs . . . . .				29,417
Sundry manufactures, packages	7,957	22,251	42,418	94,934

"These small manufactures are too often overlooked by persons from abroad who survey this populous city, and wonder how it came and what it is doing out here in the heart of what was nothing but a wilderness half a century ago. But they really constitute, as every one familiar with them knows, one of the main elements of our prosperity. And behind them lie many others, contributing their share to our comforts and our growth, which as yet enter only slightly into our export trade, and consequently are not included in our commercial tables."

machine for food. In all these cases we see combination of action, and with its growth men obtain horse-shoes and houses more readily than before. Next the little grist-mill comes, and the miller gives the labour of grinding in exchange for food to eat. Again, the little woollens-mill comes, and the miller gives his labour to the carpenter and saw-miller for labour and lumber, to the blacksmith for his iron work, and to the farmer for food and wool. Next the little furnace comes, and the furnace man, in like manner, exchanges with his neighbours, and with the progress of combination of action men obtain, at every step, food, fuel, clothing, iron, furniture, and houses, with increased facility. The first and great desire of man is that of association with his fellow-man, and it is so, because he feels that improvement of his condition, physical, moral, mental and political, is its uniform accompaniment.

Throughout this country, there is a want of combination. Men are perpetually flying from each other, scattering themselves over large surfaces, and wasting the labour that if saved would make them rich. This inability to combine their exertions is the result of artificial causes; and the adoption of the protective system has been produced by an instinctive effort to obtain by its aid that which, had those causes not existed, would have come naturally and without effort.

If we now look to the early history of these provinces, we shall see the gradual tendency towards the establishment of furnaces, woollen-mills, &c. for the purpose of enabling men to combine their exertions for obtaining iron, cloth, and other of the necessities of life with the least loss of labour in the work of transportation, whereby they might be enabled to economize their own labour to be employed in the work of production, while their sons and daughters were obtaining wages in the conversion of wool into cotton, or ore into iron.

The object of the colonial system was that of "raising up a nation of customers," a project "fit only," says Adam Smith, "for a nation of shopkeepers." He was, however, inclined to think, that even for them it was unfit, although "extremely fit for a nation whose government was influenced by shopkeepers." As early as the period immediately following the Revolution of 1688, we find the shopkeeping influence exerted for the "discouragement" of the woollens manufacture of Ireland; and while the people of that unfortunate country were thus prevented from converting their own wool into cloth, they were by other laws prevented from making any exchanges with their fellow-subjects in other colonies, unless through the medium of English ports and English "shopkeepers."

Such being the case, it was little likely that any efforts at combination of exertion among distant colonists, for rendering labour more productive of the conveniences and comforts of life, should escape the jealous eyes of men whose shopkeeping instincts had prompted them to the adoption of such measures in regard to nearer ones. The first attempt at manufacturing any species of cloth in the American provinces was followed by interference on the part of the British legislature. In 1710, the House of Commons declared, "that the erecting of manufactories in the colonies had a tendency to lessen their dependence upon Great Britain." Soon afterwards complaints were made to Parliament, that the colonists were setting up manufactories for themselves, and the House of Commons ordered the Board of Trade to report upon the subject, which was done at great length. In 1732, the exportation of hats from province to province was prohibited, and the number of apprentices to be taken by hatters was limited. In 1750, the erection of any mill or other engine for splitting or rolling iron was prohibited; but pig-iron was allowed to be imported into England duty



free, that it might then be manufactured and sent back again. At a later period, Lord Chatham declared, that he would not allow the colonists to make even a hob-nail for themselves. Such is a specimen of the system, with regard to these colonies. That in relation to the world at large shall now be given.

By the act, 5 George III. [1765,] the exportation of artisans was prohibited under a heavy penalty.

By that of 21 George III. [1781,] the exportation of utensils required for the manufacture of woollens or silk was likewise prohibited.

By that of 22 George III. [1782,] the prohibition was extended to artificers in printing calicoes, cottons, muslins or linens, or in making blocks and implements to be used in their manufacture.

By that of 25 George III. [1785,] it was extended to tools used in the iron and steel manufactures, and to the workmen employed therein.

By that of 39 George III. [1799,] it was extended to colliers.

These laws continued in full force until the year 1824, when the prohibition as to the export of artisans was abolished, and all those relating to the export of machinery so far relaxed that "permission may now be had for the exportation of all the more common articles of machinery," discretion having been given to the Board of Trade, which decides upon each application, "according to the merits of the case." But little difficulty is now, it is said, experienced by merchants, who generally know as to what machines "the indulgence will be extended, and from what it will be withheld," almost as certainly as if it had been settled by act of Parliament; yet, it is deemed advantageous to have it left discretionary with the Board, that they may have "the power of regulating the matter, according to the changing interests of commerce."\* Under this system, the whole quantity of machinery exported in the eleven years, from 1824 to 1835, averaged but two hundred thousand pounds per annum.†

We see thus, that the whole legislation of Great Britain, on this subject, has been directed to the one great object of preventing the people of her colonies, and those of independent nations, from obtaining the machinery necessary to enable them to combine their exertions for the purpose of obtaining cloth or iron, and thus *compelling* them to bring to her their raw materials, that she might convert them into the forms that fitted them for consumption, and then return to the producers a portion of them, burdened with great cost for transportation, and heavy charges for the work of conversion. We see, too, that notwithstanding the revocation of a part of the system, it is still discretionary with the Board of Trade, whether or not they will permit the export of machinery of any description.

Had it not been that there was a natural tendency to have the producer of iron and cloth, and hats, to take his place by the side of the producer of food and wool, there could never have arisen any necessity for such laws as those passed in relation to Ireland and the colonies, and had that tendency not existed, the laws prohibiting the export of machinery would never have been required. It did exist, and it does everywhere exist, and it was for the purpose of preventing the gradual development of a natural state of things, and bringing about an unnatural one, whereby Great Britain might be made "the work-shop of the world," that those laws were passed. The object of protection has been, and is, to restore the natural one.

The effect of those laws has been that of bringing about an unnatural division of her population. The loom and the anvil, in that country, instead of being second to the plough, have become first, with great deterioration in

\* Porter's Progress of the Nation, Vol. I. p. 320.

† Ibid. p. 323.



the condition of both labourer and capitalist. For a long period, the few engaged in manufactures made vast fortunes; while the owners of land were enabled to obtain enormous rents, because the consumers of food increased more rapidly than the producers of food. Land gradually consolidated itself in fewer hands, and the little occupant of a few acres gradually gave way to the great farmer, who cultivated hundreds of acres by aid of hired-labour. The few became richer, and the many went to the poor-house. The value of labour, in food, was diminished, and the value of capital was also diminished, because both were, as they still are, shut out from employment on land, the only employment in which both can be used to an indefinite extent, with constant increase in the return to labour.

By degrees, however, machinery was smuggled out of England, and artisans escaped therefrom; and at length there arose a necessity for legalizing the export of both, and from that time it is that manufactures on the continent of Europe have made great progress. The people there, however, have, like ourselves, laboured under great disadvantages. England had monopolized machinery for so long a time that she had acquired skill that could not readily be rivalled; while she had, by this improper division of her population, kept the price of labour and capital at a lower point—proportioned to the advantage with which they might have been applied—than among her neighbours. Her establishments were gigantic, and always ready to sink those who might undertake competition; while the unceasing changes in her monetary arrangements, the necessary consequences of the colonial system, were of themselves sufficient to spread ruin among all the nations connected with her. Our own experience has been that of all the world.

The necessary consequence of the existence of such a state of things, was resistance by the various independent nations of the world, in the form of tariffs of protection; one of the first results of which was the modification of the law prohibiting the export of machinery. From that period to the present, she has been engaged in an effort to under-work other nations, despite their efforts to shut her out, and with each stage of her progress the condition of her operatives, as well as that of her farm labourers, has deteriorated. Women have been substituted for men, and children of the most immature years for women, and the hours of labour have been so far extended as to render Parliamentary interference absolutely necessary. That interference was opposed, on the ground that all the profit of the machinery resulted from the running of an additional hour. In the mining department of her trade, the system is the same, and it is impossible to read the Parliamentary Reports on the condition of her manufacturing and mining labourers, without being horrified at the awful consequences that have resulted from this effort to tax the world by monopolizing machinery. The moral effects are as bad as the physical ones. Frauds of every kind have become almost universal. Flour is substituted for cotton, in the making up of cotton cloths, to such an extent that, fifteen years since, the consumption for this purpose was estimated at forty-two millions of pounds.\* The quality of iron, and of all other commodities, is uniformly reduced to the point that is required for preventing other nations from producing such commodities for themselves.

By the census of 1831, it was shown that the number of families in England and Wales was 3,303,504, of which 1,170,000 were those of agricultural occupants, or of agricultural and mining labourers, producers of things to be

---

\* "These goods are generally smoother and more evenly made than American fabrics of the same cost; but they must be used in their dry state, as in washing their appearance is very much changed."—*Dry Goods Reporter*, Nov. 1849.

converted or exchanged; leaving 2,133,000 for the converters and exchangers, and for the money-spending classes—paupers on one hand, and state annuitants, noblemen and gentlemen, on the other. Thus the products of one labourer had to be divided among three.

By the census of 1841, it was shown that, notwithstanding an increase in the last ten years of 630,000 in the number of adult males, there had been an actual diminution of 19,000 in the number employed in agriculture, and thus we have almost four persons to consume the products of one.

Since that date, the tendency has been in the same direction. The transporters, converters, and exchangers have been steadily and rapidly increasing in their proportion to the producers.

With each step in her progress, she thus becomes less a producer, and more and more a mere exchanger, dependent upon the profits of converting and exchanging the products of other nations. This steadily increasing disproportion between the producers and the exchangers, brought about the state of things that led to the repeal of the corn laws, since the date of which there is an evident increase in the tendency to become a mere exchanger of the works of other men's hands. The amount of her trade does not grow with the growth required by this change. The farmer may live and maintain his family out of a crop of five hundred bushels, or even less. The shopkeeper, to live as well, must pass through his hands five thousand bushels; and what is true of the individual shopkeeper is equally true of a nation of shopkeepers, as I will now show.

The man who raises his own food, and sells of it to the amount of \$100, has that sum to be applied to the purchase of clothing and other of the comforts of life. He is selling the product of his own labour.

The man who buys food to the extent of \$100, and sells his products for \$200, has but \$100 to be applied to the purchase of other things than food. To the extent of one-half he is selling the produce of the labour of others.

The man who buys food and leather, each to the extent of \$100, must sell \$300 worth of shoes to give him \$100 to be applied to the purchase of other things than food. To the extent of two-thirds he is selling the labour of others.

So is it with nations. When they sell their own products, their power to purchase from others is equal to the whole amount sold. When they sell the products of others, whether in the same or any other form, their power of purchase is only to the extent of the difference between the price paid and the price received. The bale of cotton exported as yarn, is but the bale imported as wool, and, to the extent of the cost of the wool, represents no part of the power to purchase for consumption. The barrel of American flour exported in the form of cloth or iron, is but the barrel of flour imported, and represents no part of the power to purchase coffee, tea, or sugar.

The actual or declared value of the exports of the produce and manufactures of Great Britain and Ireland, was,

From 1815 to 1819, annual average,	.	.	£44,000,000
“ 1827 to 1834, “ “	.	.	38,000,000
“ 1845 to 1848, “ “	.	.	50,500,000

From these sums is to be deducted, in all cases, the cost of the raw material required to produce the commodities exported.

The quantity of cotton manufactured in the first period amounted to 100,000,000 of pounds per annum, and the average price was 19 pence,\*

---

\* McCulloch's Com. Dict., art. Cotton.

making the whole cost about £8,000,000. The value of cotton goods exported was £16,500,000, of which the raw material may have been about £5,500,000.

The consumption of foreign wool was about 7,000,000 of pounds weight, and with this exception the whole amount of the export was of domestic production.

The import of food amounted to about 1,500,000 quarters, or 13,500,000 bushels of 60 pounds weight.

Putting together all the foreign food and raw materials required for the product of £44,000,000 of exports, the total cost could scarcely have exceeded £12,000,000, leaving £32,000,000 as the value of domestic products and labour exported by a population of 21,000,000, being equal to about £1·10 per head, or \$7·20, to be applied to the purchase of foreign commodities for domestic consumption.

In the second period, the quantity of cotton manufactured averaged about 275,000,000 of pounds, and the price had fallen to about 8*d.*, making the cost about £9,000,000. The proportion exported had somewhat increased, judging from the difference between the quantity as given by the official value, and the product as given by the declared value, and the amount of labour had decreased, the exports of mere yarn having risen from £1,200,000 to between four and five millions. The value of the raw cotton thus exported may have been £6,000,000.

The quantity of foreign wool retained for home consumption had risen to 30,000,000 of pounds, being an important portion of the quantity exported in the form of cloth.

The average import of food was, as before about 1,500,000 quarters. If, now, we estimate the total consumption of food and other raw materials at £14,000,000, and deduct that sum from the amount of exports, we shall have remaining £24,000,000 as the value of the products and labour exported by a population of 23,000,000, being about 2*l.*s. or \$5 per head, to be appropriated to the purchase of foreign commodities, other than grain, for consumption.

In the third period, the declared value of cotton goods exported had risen to about £25,000,000, and the cost of the raw cotton required for this purpose, in the year 1846, was estimated at about, . . . £8,500,000

And in the year 1847, at . . . . . 8,800,000

For 1845 and 1848, the average was about . . . 7,350,000

making a total average of £8,000,000. To this must now be added the wool of Australia, Spain and Germany, of which the manufacture had risen to 70,000,000 of pounds; the silks of Italy and China; the hides, the indigo and other colouring materials, the gold, and innumerable other articles used in the production of this large amount of manufactures; and I shall be safe in putting the whole amount, for those years, at not less than £14,000,000, and it is probably much more.

The import of flour and grain averaged about 6,250,000 quarters, and as the last of those years amounted to about five and a half millions, it may be safe to assume that the average quantity required will not fall materially short of six millions, equal to fifty-four millions of bushels of sixty pounds each, and if the cost of these be averaged at 4*s.* per bushel, the amount will be . . . . . £10,800,000\*

---

\* The amount actually expended in fifteen months is stated to have been £33,000,000. This, however, was an exceptional case, and my object is rather to show from the past what may be taken as an average of future years.

If, now, we add for vast quantities of live-stock, pork, beef, lard, butter, cheese, and other articles of food, the whole consumption of which was formerly supplied at home, only

1,000,000

We shall have a total of . . . . . 25,800,000

To be deducted from the gross amount of exports, and leaving only . . . . . 24,700,000

as the value of the export of the products and labour of the twenty-seven and a half millions composing the population of the United Kingdom, being about 18s. or \$4.32 per head, to be applied to the purchase of sugar, tea, coffee, rice, spices, and numerous other foreign articles of food—for lumber, tobacco, foreign manufactures of every description, and for the purchase of the cotton, silk, wool, dye-stuffs, hides, &c. &c., required for the manufacture of clothing used at home.

We have here a constantly diminishing quantity to be applied to the purchase of various descriptions of food that from luxuries have become necessities of life, and that of the materials of clothing. It follows, of course, that as food is the article of prime necessity, the amount that each expends of clothing is very small indeed; the consequence of which is, that the people of England, engaged in furnishing cheap clothing to all the world, are not only badly fed but exceedingly badly clothed, the cost of clothing, in labour, being so great as to place it beyond their reach,\* the amount that can be expended for that purpose tending rather to decrease. Whenever a good crop causes a large quantity of cotton to come to market, the price falls to the point that is necessary to enable the purchaser at home to absorb the surplus that cannot be exported; and when the crop is short, the consumption is limited to the quantity that can be purchased by the small amount to be expended. The whole sum now applicable to this purpose appears not to vary greatly from 2s. per head, sufficient to purchase three pounds at 8*d.*, or six pounds at 4*d.* This will be seen by an examination of the following table:—

\* By reference to the report of the Assistant Commissioner charged with the inquiry into the condition of women and children employed in agriculture, it will be seen that a change of clothes seems to be out of the question. The upper parts of the under-clothes of women at work, even their stays, quickly become wet with perspiration, while the lower parts cannot escape getting equally wet in nearly every kind of work in which they are employed, except in the driest weather. It not unfrequently happens that a woman, on returning from work, is obliged to go to bed for an hour or two to allow her clothes to be dried. It is also by no means uncommon for her, if she does not do this, to put them on again the next morning nearly as wet as when she took them off.

The evidence laid before Parliament in regard to the situation of the operatives in coal mines, showed that men and women, boys and girls, were accustomed to work together in a state of absolute and entire nudity.

The slowness with which the power of consuming other articles than clothing has grown is remarkable.

In 1803, that of paper was . . . . .	31,699,537 pounds.
1841, with almost double the population, only . . . . .	97,103,548 "

The great diminution in the cost of cotton and linen cloth had been attended with a corresponding reduction in the cost of rags, while there had been great improvements in the mode of manufacture. The quantity of labour that could be exchanged against paper had evidently diminished.

The consumption of candles in 1801, was . . . . .	66,999,080 pounds.
In 1830 it was . . . . .	116,851,305 "

having little more than kept pace with the population.



# THE HARMONY OF INTERESTS.

Average cost of Cotton in England.		Home consumption.	Money price, per head.	
	d.		s.	d.
1845 . . .	4 $\frac{3}{4}$	170 millions	about 2	4 $\frac{1}{2}$
1846 . . .	5	155 "	"	2 3
1847 . . .	6 $\frac{3}{8}$	80 "	"	1 7
1848 . . .	4 $\frac{1}{2}$	170 "	"	2 3

We see, thus, that she clothes her people at the cost of the cotton planter. She has a certain quantity of labour that she can give in exchange for cotton, and the price of the whole import is regulated thereby. If the crop is large, she takes a great deal for the money; if it is small, she takes but little; and thus the producer not only derives no benefit from large crops, but is so much injured thereby, that it is actually more profitable to have one of 2,000,000 of bales, than one of 2,700,000. Had that of the present year reached three millions, he would have been ruined, for freights would have been high, while prices abroad would have fallen to a lower point than has ever yet been reached.

Instead of applying her labour to the cultivation of her own soil, she pursues a course having for its object that of compelling all the farmers and planters of the world to make their exchanges in her markets, where she fixes the price for the world. Her power to apply the proceeds of labour to the purchase of other commodities than those of prime necessity is small, and gradually but steadily diminishing; and whenever the labours of the producer are rewarded with liberal returns, he is nearly ruined, because the price falls below the cost of production.

The system is altogether so remarkable that at some future day it will be deemed almost impossible that it should ever have been tolerated. She has a certain quantity of the means of transportation and conversion, and being thus provided she desires that all the cotton and sheep's-wool of the world shall be brought to her, that it may be spun and woven, and that she may take toll for spinning and weaving it. The more that is brought to her the less of it she gives back to the producer, and the price she pays him fixes the price he receives from all the world. How the system works may be seen from the following statement:—

	1815 to 1819.	1827-1834.	1845-1846.
Cotton consumed, lbs. . . . .	100,000,000	275,000,000	596,000,000
Value . . . . .	£8,000,000	9,000,000	11,400,000

She pays for this in cotton-cloth and iron, the prices of which, at these periods were as follows:—

A piece of calico, of 24 yards . . . . .	16/6*	7/6†	6/7
A ton of merchant-bar iron . . . . .	£11‡	£7 5	£9 10

Had the whole been paid in these, the planter would have received of

Cloth, pieces . . . . .	9,700,000	24,000,000	34,700,000
Or iron, tons . . . . .	730,000	1,250,000	1,200,000

The *additional* freight, home and foreign, charges, commissions, &c., in the last period were, at three cents per pound, on 496,000,000 of pounds, say \$15,000,000. For this the planter would receive, in *Liverpool*, 470,000 *additional* tons of iron, the value of which, in *Liverpool*, at the present moment, would be about \$11,000,000, and thus he not only gave away his cotton, but gave with it a large portion of the cost of transportation. The whole return to him for 600,000,000 was not as great as it had been to 100,000,000.

It thus appears that notwithstanding all the improvements in manufacture, the planter had to give in the last period *six times* the quantity of cotton to

\* McCulloch's Statistics, Vol. II. p. 70.

† This is the average of the years from 1831 to 1834, as given in Burns's Commercial Glance, and copied in the Merchants' Magazine, Vol. XIX. p. 277.

‡ Average of 1817 to 1819—Merchants' Magazine, Vol. XX. p. 337.

obtain *three and a half times* the cloth that he could have had in the first—and *six times* the quantity to obtain a *smaller quantity* of iron. A more admirable mode of taxing the world was certainly never devised.

The result of the system is, that the productiveness of agricultural labour is declining in every portion of the world that does not protect itself against this “war upon labour and capital,” as I will now show.

Consumption is measured by production. Every man is a consumer to the whole extent of his production. To that point he will go, and beyond it he cannot go. The first of his wants is food; next comes clothing; after this follow the conveniences and luxuries of life. If his productive power increases, his power to obtain clothing increases rapidly, because the whole surplus is applicable to other things than food. If it diminishes, his power to obtain clothing diminishes with great rapidity, for food he must have. That it has diminished, and is now diminishing rapidly, will, I think, be evident from the following facts:—

Sixty years since, the price paid by the consumers of cotton to the producers of it was estimated at \$40,000,000.

From 1827 to 1834, both inclusive, the crops of the United States averaged 945,000 bales, and the home consumption about 145,000, leaving 800,000 for export. The average price was about \$40 per bale, and the product \$32,000,000.

In this period, India continued to produce extensively of cotton, and to manufacture cotton goods. The China market was not opened to the free traders until 1831, and it required some time to substitute the cotton cloth of England for the cotton and cloth of India. With every day that has since elapsed, the production of cotton has declined, as the manufacture has been passing towards annihilation. Cotton was then extensively raised in the West Indies, Brazil, Egypt, Africa, Mexico, and elsewhere; and the total product, exclusive of that of the United States, was estimated at 450,000,000 of pounds, or about one-fifth more than that of the Union. Averaging the whole at the same price, we should now obtain an annual expenditure, excluding our own, for cotton wool, of \$78,000,000.

From 1842 to 1848, both inclusive, the crop averaged 2,060,000 bales, and the home consumption about 400,000, leaving 1,660,000 for export. Two hundred thousand of these may be given to the Zollverein, and other countries of Europe that have protected themselves against the system, not as the increased quantity actually taken under low prices, but as that which would have gone at high ones, leaving 1,460,000 for the quantity that may be supposed to be influenced by the system. The average price, during that period, was seven and a half cents, or \$34 per bale, and the average product of the portion of the crop thus exported, \$50,000,000.

Since then, the cultivator of this most important commodity, throughout the world, has been ruined, and it is greatly to be doubted if the whole production, outside of the Union, is now more than one half of what it was thirty years since; but, at the utmost, it cannot exceed 270,000,000; and if we now assume that quantity, and, as before, put the whole at the same price, we shall obtain, as the amount paid for cotton, by almost the whole population of the world, outside of the Union, as follows:—

For the crop of this country,	.	.	\$50,000,000
For that of the rest of the world,	.	.	20,000,000
			<hr/>
			\$70,000,000

Showing a large reduction, notwithstanding the increase in the number of persons employed in its production, and the increase of those who should consume it, and yet the case, as here stated, does not represent the real

diminution in the amount paid to the producers. Of the cotton of India, nearly the whole value is now swallowed up in freights, and while the cost to the consumer is large, the yield to the producer is scarcely more than two cents per pound. A more full examination of the subject would, I believe, result in showing that the producers of cotton, taken as a body, do not receive in return for all the clothing material that has to so great an extent superseded wool, flax, &c., from the people of the world outside of the limits of the Union, twenty millions of dollars more than they did sixty years since.

A similar examination of the movement in regard to sugar, coffee, wool, and other articles, would yield the same results, for the exhaustion is everywhere the same. The whole effect of the system is that of reducing the farmer and the planter—the producers of the good things of the world—to the condition of an humble dependence upon the owners of a quantity of small machinery for the conversion of wool into cloth, that they themselves could purchase at the cost of less labour than, for want of it, they waste in each and every year.

Let us now look to the results, as exhibited in the immediate dependencies of England.

With this vast increase in the importation of food from abroad has come the ruin of the people of Ireland. Deprived of manufactures and commerce, her people were driven to live by agriculture alone, and she was enabled to drag on a miserable existence, so long as her neighbour was content to make some compensation for the loss of labour by paying her for her products higher prices than those at which they might have been elsewhere purchased. With the repeal of the corn laws, that resource has failed; and the result is a state of poverty, wretchedness, and famine, that has compelled the establishment of a system which obliges the landowner to maintain the people, whether they work or not; and thus is one of the conditions of slavery re-established in that unhappy country. From being a great exporter of food, she has now become a large importer. The great market for Indian corn is Ireland—a country in which the production of food is almost the sole occupation of the people. The value of labour in food, throughout a population of eight millions, is thus rapidly decreasing.

From an inquiry instituted by Lord Clarendon, in 1847, and conducted in the most careful manner, it was ascertained that out of 20,800,000 acres of which the kingdom consists, there were but 5,200,000 under crop, and that the yield of cereal grains, chiefly oats, averaged 10 bushels (of 70 pounds) per head, while that of potatoes was 561 pounds per head. The cattle amounted to 2,591,000, or less than one to three persons of the population; the hogs to 622,000, or one to thirteen; and the sheep to 2,186,177, or one to four. Such are the products of a nation, exclusively agricultural, whose numbers were about one-half those of the people of the Union, at our last census.

Were it possible now to ascertain the quantity of food, per head, produced in Great Britain and Ireland, it is probable that it would be found to be less than it was five years since, and that the whole quantity, foreign and domestic, was not materially greater than at that date. If so, it follows that the whole amount of labour expended in purchasing and fashioning the cotton of other lands to be given in exchange for food, is lost labour, and that the average quantity of food and of other commodities obtainable throughout the kingdom in return for any given quantity, tends downwards instead of upwards; and that such is the case there is reason to believe. As evidence that such is the fact, we may take the expenditure for support of paupers, which in 1837 was £4,207,000, and for 1844, 5, and 6, averaged £5,890,000,

being an increase of forty per cent. in eight years. In 1848, it had attained the enormous height of £7,800,000. If now to this we were to add the expenditure for the same purpose in Ireland, we should find the growth to be absolutely terrific.

As a full answer to this, the English economist would point to the increased consumption of certain commodities; but that increase is maintained, as we have seen, by the oppression and ruin of the agriculturist everywhere. The whole system has for its object an increase in the number of persons that are to intervene between the producer and the consumer—living on the product of the land and labour of others, diminishing the power of the first, and increasing the number of the last; and thus it is that Ireland is compelled to waste more labour annually than would be required to produce, thrice over, all the iron, and convert into cloth all the cotton and wool manufactured in England. The poverty of producers exists nearly in the ratio in which they are compelled to make their exchanges in the market of Great Britain, foregoing the advantages that would result to them from the free exercise of the power of associating for the purpose of combining their exertions, and thus rendering their labour more effective.

The manufacturers of India have been ruined, and that great country is gradually and certainly deteriorating and becoming depopulated, to the surprise of those of the people of England who are familiar with its vast advantages, and who do not understand the destructive character of their own system. The London *Economist* says:—

“Looking to our Indian empire, we cannot but be struck with the singular facilities which—in climate, soil, and population—it presents to the commerce of Great Britain. At first sight, it seems to offer every thing that could be devised, in order to induce to a commercial intercourse almost without limit. There is scarcely one important article of tropical produce which is consumed in this country, either as the raw material of our manufactures, or as an article of daily use, for the production of which India is not as well, or better, adapted than any other country; while its dense and industrious population would seem to offer an illimitable demand for our manufactures. Nor are there opposed to these natural and flattering elements of commerce any fiscal restrictions to counteract their beneficial results. Indian produce has long entered into consumption in the home markets on the most favourable terms; while, in the introduction of British manufactures into India, a very moderate duty is imposed. Yet, notwithstanding all these advantages, it is a notorious fact, deducible alike from the tendency which the supply of some of the most important articles of Indian produce show to fall off, and from the stagnant, or rather declining, state of the export of our manufactures to those markets—and, perhaps, still more so, from the extremely unprofitable and unsatisfactory result which has attended both the export and import trade with India for some time past,—that there exist some great and serious impediments to the realization of the just and fair hopes entertained with regard to our Indian trade.”

Another writer\* speaks of it as a country whose exports are rapidly diminishing. Sugar, he says, does not increase, while indigo decreases, and cotton is reduced one-third to one-half. The revenue is deficient. Gazerat and Cutch, which once supplied cotton to half the world, have almost ceased to produce it. The growth and manufacture of cotton have disappeared from Bengal, which once gave to the world the Dacca muslins, the finest in the world. Cotton fields have everywhere relapsed into jungle.

Year after year we are told of efforts being made to increase the product and improve the quality of India cotton, and yet year after year the prospect of improvement becomes more remote, and necessarily so, because agricultural improvement under the existing impoverishing system is im-

---

\* London correspondent of the National Intelligencer.



possible. For a short period, premiums were granted on what is called free sugar—to wit, that raised by the wretched Hindoo who perishes of starvation, the consequence of the system—and while that policy was maintained its cultivation made some progress, but since the abolition of the restrictions on slave-grown sugar, every thing tends downward.\*

Ireland and India are thus in the same condition. The West Indies are ruined, and Canada, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick, now seek annexation, that they may have protection from a system under which they are being ruined. The owner of land, everywhere, knows that it would be doubled by the change, and the labourer transfers himself to the south of the boundary-line, that he may find employment and good wages, which cannot be found at the north of it. Those who remain north of it now anxiously seek for admission for their grain, because protection maintains a market that now they cannot have.

In the existing state of things they have to compete with the low-priced labour of Russia and Poland, and are ruined. They desire, therefore, that their competition may be with the protected farmers and labourers of the Union.

Lord Sydenham, in a letter to Lord John Russell, which accompanied his Report on Emigration to Upper Canada, observed :

“Give me yeomen, with a few hundred pounds each, who will buy cleared farms, not throw themselves into the bush, and I will ensure them comforts and independence at the end of a couple of years—pigs, pork, flour, potatoes, horses to ride, cows to milk—but you must eat all your produce, for devil a purchaser is to be found: however, the man’s wants are supplied, and those of his family; he has no rent or taxes to pay, and he ought to be satisfied.”

Here is the cause of the desire for annexation that now exists throughout Canada. There are no consumers at hand, and the farmer cannot exchange his corn for cloth or iron, the consequence of which is, that labour and land are almost valueless. So is it everywhere. Every colony therefore desires to separate itself from England, and all would gladly unite with these United States, and for no other reason than that they might have protection.

That the colonial system is rapidly approaching its close must, I think, be obvious to all who take the trouble to inform themselves of the condition of the people of her colonies, who have been compelled to bear with it; and thence satisfy themselves that the independent nations of the world must continue to increase and to strengthen their measures of resistance until it shall be ended, that thenceforth there may be perfect freedom of trade.

It is “a war upon the labour and capital of the world.” Its object is that of preventing the spinner and weaver from combining their efforts with those

---

\*“For many years they [Messrs. Arbuthnot & Co., of Madras] have been the most extensive manufacturers of sugar in Southern India, converting to the extent of thousands of tons annually the coarse jaggery made by the ryots into the fine product which finds its way into the market; but the attempt to raise the cane was first tried about two or three years since, and it is needless to say that no cost or skill was spared to render it successful. Planters were brought from the West Indies at liberal salaries to direct the cultivation, and machinery of the most complete and extensive character was imported from England to irrigate the soil and manufacture the sugar on the spot. No project could possibly be set on foot under circumstances more favourable, but the upshot is that the land taken in Rajahmundry and Dawlaishwarum has been relinquished, and the cattle turned into the fields of standing cane. \* \* \* \*

“The question of competition to be maintained on the existing system with the West Indies and the countries in which slave labour prevails must rest for future consideration. At present we have arrived at the important conclusion, that, under the most favourable circumstances, we cannot hope to alter the present mode of cultivating the sugar-cane in Southern India.”—*Athenæum*.

of the farmer and planter,—compelling the latter to work alone, and therefore disadvantageously, and then to give two-thirds of the crop for the maintenance of horses and wagons, ships and men, brokers and merchants, whose services would not be needed were the system abolished. Its effects have been everywhere, to render men depressed and poor. Desiring to liberate themselves from it our ancestors made the Revolution, and the Canadians have now formed a league, induced thereto by their observance of the wonderful results that have been here obtained.

Thus far, the system has been maintained at home by this power to tax the world for its support. India contributes three millions sterling per annum,\* but there is a gradual diminution in the power to pay. Canada and the West Indies have paid their share, but the connection with the former is likely soon to be at an end, and the latter are ruined. This country is the main support of the system, but that support is gradually being withdrawn, and when it shall be absolutely so, the destructive effects of it upon England herself will become fully obvious. It will then be seen that the wealth of that country is really, to use the words of Carlyle, but a magnificent “sham.” The few are rich, but the many are poor, and the mass of wealth is by no means great.

The whole amount of capital invested in buildings, machinery, &c. for the cotton manufacture, in 1834, was estimated at twenty millions of pounds sterling† or less than a hundred millions of dollars, being only double what has been expended in the effort to bring into activity the anthracite coal mines of Pennsylvania. She has also machinery for the production of a large amount of coal and iron, but the same quantity could be produced in this country in a few years, without an effort. She has made a considerable amount of rail-roads, but she broke down under the effort, and yet roads are made in that country at far less cost than here, and we have now more miles in operation.

The nominal cost of her roads is great, because the prices paid for land are high, and large sums are paid to lawyers, conveyancers, &c., &c., but these are merely transfers of property, not investments of it. The real investment is only the labour employed in grading the road, erecting the bridges, and getting out the iron, and the cost of these per mile is less than for any well-made road in this country. The power of England to make investments of labour is less than half of what it was in this country from 1844 to 1847, and less than one-third of what it would now be had the production of coal, and iron, and cotton goods been allowed to increase at the rate at which it was then increasing. Her system tends to the enrichment of the few, and hence there results a show of wealth far, very far, beyond the reality.

The impoverishing effects of the system were early obvious, and to the endeavour to account for the increasing difficulty of obtaining food where the whole action of the laws tended to increase the number of consumers of food, and to diminish the number of producers, was due the invention of the Malthusian theory of population, now half a century old. That was followed by the Ricardo doctrine of Rent, which accounted for the scarcity of food by asserting, as a fact, that men always commenced the work of cultivation on rich soils, and that as population increased they were obliged to resort to poorer ones, yielding a constantly diminishing return to labour, and producing a constant necessity for separating from each other, if they would

\* “Altogether it has been calculated that the tribute which India pours into the lap of England is at least equal to three millions sterling.”—*Porter's Progress of the Nation*, Vol. iii. p. 354.

† McCulloch's Statistics, Vol. 2, page 75.

obtain a sufficiency of food. Upon this theory is based the whole English politico-economical system. Population is first supposed to be superabundant, when in scarcely any part of the earth could the labour of the same number of persons that now constitute the population of England obtain even one-half the same return. Next, it is supposed that men who fly from England go always to the cultivation of rich soils, and therefore every thing is done to expel population. Lastly, it is held that their true policy when abroad is to devote all their labour to the cultivation of those rich soils, sending the produce to England that it may be converted into cloth and iron, and they are cautioned against any interference with perfect freedom of trade as "a war upon labour and capital."

Colonization is urged on all hands, and all unite in the effort to force emigration in the direction needed to raise up "colonies of customers." It is impossible to read any work on the subject without being struck with the prevalence of this "shopkeeping" idea. It is seen everywhere. Hungary was to be supported in her efforts for the establishment of her independence, because she was willing to have free trade, and thus make a market for British manufactures. The tendency of the Ricardo-Malthusian system to produce intensity of selfishness was never more strikingly manifested than on that occasion.

It happens, unfortunately, that the system is without a base, the fact being exactly the reverse of what it is stated by Mr. Ricardo to be. Throughout the world, and at all periods of time, men have commenced the work of cultivation upon the poorer soils, leaving to their successors the clearing of river bottoms and the draining of swamps; and the increase of population it has been that has everywhere enabled men to subject rich soils to cultivation.\* Food, therefore, tends to grow faster than population, when no disturbing causes exist, and in order that the increase of population may take place, it is indispensable that the consumer take his place by the side of the producer. When that is not the case, the inevitable consequence is that the waste of labour is great, and that the perpetual cropping of the land returning to it none of the refuse, exhausts the land and its owner, and compels the latter to fly to other poor soils, increasing the transportation and diminishing still further the quantity of cloth and iron to be obtained in return to a given amount of labour.

We thus have here, first, a system that is unsound and unnatural, and second, a theory invented for the purpose of accounting for the poverty and wretchedness which are its necessary results. The miseries of Ireland are charged to over-population, although millions of acres of the richest soils of the kingdom are waiting drainage to take their place among the most productive in the world, and although the people of Ireland are compelled to waste more labour than would pay, many times over, for all the cloth and iron they consume.† The wretchedness of Scotland is charged to over-

\* For a full examination of this question I must refer to my book, "The Past, the Present, and the Future."

† Of single counties, Mayo, with a population of 389,000, and a rental of only 300,000*l.*, has an area of 1,364,000 acres, of which 800,000 are waste! No less than 470,000 acres, being very nearly equal to the whole extent of surface now under cultivation, are declared to be reclaimable. Galway, with a population of 423,000, and a valued rental of 433,000*l.*, has upwards of 700,000 acres of waste, 410,000 of which are reclaimable! Kerry, with a population of 293,000, has an area of 1,186,000 acres—727,000 being waste, and 400,000 of them reclaimable! Even the union of Glenties, Lord Monteaigle's *ne plus ultra* of redundant population, has an area of 245,000 acres, of which 200,000 are waste, and for the most part reclaimable, to its population of 43,000. While the barony of Ennis, that abomination of desolation, has 230,000 acres of land to its 5,000 paupers—a proportion which, as Mr. Carter, one of the principal proprietors, remarks in his circular advertise-



population when a large portion of the land is so tied up by entails as to forbid improvement, and almost to forbid cultivation. The difficulty of obtaining food in England is ascribed to over-population, when throughout the kingdom a large portion of the land is occupied as pleasure grounds, by men whose fortunes are due to the system which has ruined Ireland and India.\* Over-population is the ready excuse for all the evils of a vicious system, and so will it continue to be until that system shall see its end, the time for which is now rapidly approaching.

To *maintain* it, the price of labour in England must be kept steadily at a point so low as to enable her to underwork the Hindoo, the German, and the American, with all the disadvantage of freight and duties. To *terminate* it, the price of labour in England must be raised to such a point as will prevent that competition and compel her to raise her own food, leaving others to consume their own, and such must be the result of the thorough adoption of the protective system, even by the United States alone.

The cause of the difficulty in which England now finds herself is the unnatural disproportion between consumers and producers. Men are cheap and therefore undervalued. Establish a market for these men, and their value will rise, and such will be the effect in every part of Europe. We have seen that immigration into this country increased in the period between 1830 and 1834, from twelve to sixty-seven thousand; that from that period to 1843 it remained almost stationary; and that in the last four years it has more than trebled. Now, let us suppose that the system of 1828 had been maintained, and that the mining of coal, the smelting and rolling of iron, and the manufacture of cotton and woollen cloths, &c. had gone on uninterruptedly, producing a great demand for labour to be employed in the various branches of manufacture, in the making of roads, the clearing of lands and the building of houses, and that the inducements for emigration to this country had been constantly increasing to such an extent as to cause the

---

ment for tenants, "is at the rate of only one family to 230 acres; so that if but one head of a family were employed to every 230 acres, there need not be a single pauper in the entire district; a proof," he adds, "THAT NOTHING BUT EMPLOYMENT IS WANTING TO SET THIS COUNTRY TO RIGHTS!" In which opinion we fully coincide.—*Westminster Review*.

\* Poulett Scrope, a member of the British Parliament, has inserted in the *London Morning Chronicle* seven letters of Notes of a Tour in the United Kingdom, with a view to ascertain whether the labouring population be really redundant. His general conclusion is expressed in these terms:—"I have selected striking illustrations in support of the view I have always entertained, and which is at length obtaining very general acquiescence: namely, that the population of the United Kingdom is not really in excess; that the land is everywhere—even in the most seemingly over-peopled and pauperized districts of Ireland—amply capable of repaying the employment of additional labour to an indefinite extent, if only judicious use be made of it by those whom the law has intrusted with its ownership, and that the law itself be so modified as to encourage, instead of discouraging, improvement, to secure to industry its due reward, and to neglect and mismanagement its fitting punishment."

The notes on Ireland, afford a frightful picture of one of the many evils with which that country is afflicted:

"In Galway Union, recent accounts declared the number of poor evicted, and their homes levelled within the last two years, to equal the numbers in Kilrush—4,000 families and 20,000 human beings are said to have been here also thrown upon the road, homeless and homeless. I can readily believe the statement, for to me some parts of the country appeared like an enormous graveyard—the numerous gables of the unroofed dwellings seemed to be gigantic tombstones. They were, indeed, records of decay and death far more melancholy than the grave can show. Looking on them, the doubt rose in my mind, am I in a civilized country? Have we really a free constitution? Can such scenes be paralleled in Siberia or Caffraria?"



ratio of increase from 1830 to 1834 to be maintained, and see what would have been the result. By the year 1839 it would have reached 300,000, and five years after it would have exceeded a million, and the growth would every year have been more rapid, for the demand for labour would have increased faster than the supply.

Before this time, the flight from Great Britain and Ireland alone would have far exceeded half a million per annum, and what would be the effect of such a state of things may be conceived by those who read the following article which I take from the London *Times*.

The flight of a quarter of a million inhabitants of these islands to distant quarters of the world in 1847, was one of the most marvellous events in the annals of human migration. The miserable circumstances under which the majority left their homes, the element traversed in quest of a refuge, the thousands of miles over which the dreary pilgrimage was protracted, the fearful casualties of the voyage by shipwreck, by famine and by fever, constituted a fact which we believe to be entirely without precedent, and compared with which the irruption of the northern races into southern Europe became mere summer's excursions; but, perhaps the marvel of the event is surpassed this year. The impetus, or rather the combination of impelling causes, no longer exists. It might be supposed that so extensive a drain had exhausted the migratory elements of the nation.

It might also be expected that the countries which last year could not receive the fugitive masses without much difficulty and complaint, would have offered vehement protests against an immediate renewal of the hungry invasion. It is, nevertheless, the fact that the migration of this year is nearly equal to that of the last. The grand total from all the British ports for the first eleven months of last year was 244,251; for the first eleven months of this year, 220,053. Nor do these figures represent the whole truth of the case. They are merely the numbers of those who embarked at ports where there are government emigration officers, and who have passed under official review. Some thousands of the better class of emigrants are not included in the census. There can, therefore, be no doubt that in these two years more than half a million natives of these islands have fled to other shores.

The annual migration, it appears, is now approaching the annual increase of our population, which is vulgarly magnified into a thousand a day, but in fact is not more than about 290,000 in the year. Now, it is not to be imagined for a moment that Great Britain, at all events, has reached the limit of its population. The capital, the stock and the "plant" of the island are continually increasing and have lately increased more rapidly than ever. They also demand more and more hands for their further development. Under ordinary circumstances, therefore, we should be justified in dreading a migration which left the population stationary; and which, with a view to the growing trade and resources of the country, was rather a depopulation than anything else. At all events, the fact suggests that a spontaneous movement of so gigantic a character may well be left to itself, and requires no artificial stimulus. The matter certainly has come to that pass which makes caution the first duty of the state.

It is from Ireland that we draw our rough labour. The Celt—and we are bound to give him credit for it—is the hewer of wood and drawer of water to the Saxon. Can we spare that growing mine of untaught but teachable toil? *The great works of this country depend on cheap labour.* The movement now in progress bids fair to affect that condition of the national prosperity. The United States gain what we lose.

Protection is a measure of necessary defence against a system that tends to lessen everywhere the value of labour, and if applied effectually, the correction will be speedy, and thenceforward trade may everywhere be free. To those who doubt this, I would recommend an examination of the effects that would now result from the abolition of the tariff, and the substitution of free trade for the present imperfect protection. They could not but see that it would close every mill and furnace in the Union, cutting off a demand for 600,000 bales of cotton, and a supply of 700,000 tons of iron. Where then should we sell the one, or where buy the other? The labourer in factories and furnaces would then grow food, but the market abroad for food is

now almost closed\*—or cotton, and the market for cotton is already ruined whenever the crop touches the point of two millions and a half of bales. Protection is right or wrong. Free trade is right or wrong. If protection is right, it should be complete and fixed, until no longer needed. If free trade is right, custom-houses should be abolished. Halfway measures are always wrong.

The direct effect of the maintenance of the present system, that of 1846, is to cause renewed efforts on the part of England for engrossing the market of this country, whereas a return to that of 1842, were it made with the approbation and consent of all parts of the Union, would be followed by results that would compel a change of policy. The direct effect of a thorough and complete change in our system would be, that of teaching the whole people of England that if they "expect to be prosperous and happy, they must seek those blessings in the steady pursuit of a British policy—in cultivating domestic resources—in protecting domestic interests—in drawing closely the bonds of concord, strengthened by the ties of mutual dependence among themselves, and abandoning the shadowy and delusive expectation of finding compensation in foreign commerce for the destruction of the springs of domestic consumption."

The harmony of all real interests among nations is perfect. The system of England is rotten and unsound—injurious to herself and to the world. It is the cause of pauperism and wretchedness at home and abroad, and the more effective the measures that may be adopted for the purpose of compelling its abandonment, the better will it be for her and for ourselves. The road to absolute freedom of trade lies through perfect protection.

## CHAPTER SIXTH.

### HOW PROTECTION AFFECTS COMMERCE.

COMMERCE is an exchange of equivalents. The greater the number of commodities produced, the greater, other things being equal, will be the number of exchanges. Commerce tends, therefore, to grow with the increase of production.

The machine of production is the earth. The instrument by aid of which it is made to produce is man. To induce man to labour, he must feel confident of obtaining an equivalent; and the larger that equivalent, the stronger will be the inducement to exertion. The more advantageously his powers are applied, the larger will be the production, and the larger the equivalent of a given quantity of labour.

One man raises grain and another sugar. Each desires to exchange with the other, giving labour for labour.

---

\* The present price of flour in England varies little from \$5. What is likely soon to be the price of pork, may be judged of from the following, which I take from the papers of the day.

A London letter, under date of Oct. 12, from a mercantile house extensively engaged in the trade, says: "We have the pleasure to hand you annexed our price current, in which you will see the comparative imports for the last three years; the present year showing an excess of 25,000 packages of American bacon more than the last. The general expectation with us is that prices must be very low the approaching season, from the increase of hogs in Ireland and Germany, and the very great production of hogs and all kinds of meat in this country more than usual. We incline to the opinion that should the same quantity and quality of American come to this market the next, as during the past season, one-half of it will have to be sold for soap purposes. You will have heard that our government contract for pork was taken at 10/ per cwt. less than last year, which we think is a pretty fair criterion of the market."

The quantity of grain that must be given for sugar is dependent upon the quantity of both produced. If the season be favourable for the first, the crop will be large. If unfavourable for the second, the crop will be small. Much grain will then be given for little sugar, and *vice versa*, if the season be favourable for sugar and unfavourable for grain, much sugar will be given for little grain. In either case both parties suffer, and commerce is diminished. Each is therefore directly interested in doing whatever may be in his power to increase the returns to the labour of his neighbour, and thus increase the extent of commerce.

To increase production is, then, to increase commerce. By ascertaining the circumstances which tend to limit the one, we shall ascertain those which tend to limit the other. To do so, it is needed only to call to our aid a few simple laws that may be found in any treatise of natural philosophy. They are these:—

First. The greater the power, other circumstances being equal, the greater will be the effect.

The producer of food labours every day and all day. The producer of sugar labours but three days in the week. The quantity of food produced is large and that of sugar small. The food-producer gives much food for little sugar—much labour for little labour.

What is true of individuals is equally true of communities. If the community of food-producers work every day, and that of sugar-producers but three days in the week, the whole of the first will be taxed because of the indolence of the last, and commerce will be diminished. If the whole community of food-producers work every day, and one half of that of iron-producers do not work—or if they apply their labour to other works than those of production—the quantity of iron produced will be small, and much food will be given for little iron. If the food-producing community could induce the workers in iron to labour every day and all day, there would be more iron to be given for food, commerce would be increased, and all would profit thereby. By what means could this be accomplished? To ascertain this, we must inquire the causes of their working so little. Doing so, we might find that among them there was a large proportion perfectly able to labour productively, but unwilling so to do; that some of them employed themselves in carrying muskets, casting cannon, building forts and palaces, constructing ships of war and sailing in them; and that others did nothing except so far as they were employed in devising modes of enabling them, out of the labour of others, to support themselves and those employed in the various operations to which I have referred; and that hosts of others were employed in carrying back and forth the products of the lands of others, and keeping accounts of what they did, and that thus one half of the community produced nothing, while consuming much. The other half we might find to consist of men who were sometimes willing to work but not able, having no work to do, and at others able but not willing, because of the small equivalent obtained, by reason of the necessity for contributing so large a portion of their earnings to the support of those who carried the muskets, built the ships and kept the accounts; and the result might be, that we should find that, although the food-producers gave much, the iron-producers received little, the principal part being swallowed up by the intermediate men, who consumed much while producing nothing. It is obvious that if all worked, there would be three times as much iron produced, that commerce would be increased, and that the producer of food would obtain far more iron as the equivalent of far less food. The food-producing community is therefore contributing largely towards the support of those of the iron-producing one who are able to work and not willing to do so; and their condition will be improved if they can induce those who are able



and willing to work to come forth from among those who are neither able nor willing, leaving the latter class to produce food and iron for themselves. The amount of power to be applied will be increased, and the product will be greater, while there will be fewer among whom to divide it. The return to labour will be larger, and the power of accumulation will be increased.

Second. The more directly power is applied, the greater is its effect.

The producers of food and iron are distant from each other, and the labour required for effecting their exchanges is great. The one obtains his iron by the indirect process of raising food for distant men. The other obtains his food by that of making iron for distant men, and many horses and wagons, ships and men, stand between them. The friction is great and production is small. The equivalents to be exchanged are few in number, and commerce is limited. The equivalent of a day's labour in either food or iron is small. If the producer of iron could draw near to the producer of food, the number of horses and wagons, ships and men, standing between them, would be diminished, and the number of producers would be increased. The equivalents to be exchanged would increase in number, commerce would grow, and the equivalent of a day's labour would be greater.

Third. The more steadily power is applied, the greater is its effect. At one moment the wind blows a gale, while at another there is a calm. The steam-engine works every day and all day, and although the amount of power applied is less, the voyage is made in shorter time. To secure the steady application of power, the air-chamber is provided, and the force produced by the action of the piston-rod is by its aid distributed over the whole period intervening between the strokes.

The producer of food is often idle. At other times he is moderately employed. In harvest times he is hurried, and he loses part of his crop for want of aid. If he could have the equivalent of an air-chamber, by aid of which his efforts could be divided over the year, the return obtained for his labours would be largely increased.

The producer of iron may labour at all seasons, but a large portion of his work—the mining of coal and ore—may be done in advance, and when he has a stock on hand he can suspend his operations for a season. If the producer of food could induce him to come and labour in his vicinity, he could at one period of the year help him to mine or transport ore and fuel, and the other could, at another period, aid him in gathering his crop. The first could then cultivate more land, and the equivalent of labour, in both food and iron, would be increased, and commerce would grow in extent with the increase of equivalents to be exchanged.

Fourth. The more perfect the machinery the smaller will be the quantity required, the less will be the friction, and the greater will be the effect. The iron wheels of the engine encounter little friction in passing on the iron rail, and the force of a man's hand moves tons, where, if applied to a cart-wheel, it could not move a hundred.

The producer of food obtains from the distant iron man small supplies of iron as the equivalent of large quantities of food. He is therefore obliged to use wood where he would desire to use iron. The friction is great, and labour is unproductive. The equivalent of a day's labour is small. If he could induce the iron man to come near him, the equivalent of labour would be largely increased, and he could use iron in place of wood.

Fifth. The more enduring the machinery, the smaller will be the quantity of labour required for its reproduction, and the greater will be the quantity that may be given to the production of further machinery. The wooden post rots, and must be replaced. The iron one endures almost for ever.

The producer of food, distant from the producer of iron, builds ships, and



fences his land with wooden posts. Much of his time is occupied in repairing and renewing them. If he could induce the producer of iron to live near him, he would assist in building furnaces, and might then use iron posts; and then labour that would otherwise be employed in renewing old, might be given to creating new machinery of other kinds, to aid in the work of production, and the equivalent of a day's labour would be increased.

We see, thus, that the larger the quantity of labour, and the more directly and steadily it is applied, and the more perfect and enduring the machinery by which it is aided, the larger is the return to labour, and the greater the number of equivalents to be exchanged.

Let us now suppose, first, that one community has it in its power to monopolize the production of iron, and that of its members many spend all their time in idleness, while others are but occasionally employed—that many spend their time in carrying muskets on their shoulders, while very many are dissolute and drunken—and that the result is, that the quantity of iron produced is but one half or one-third of what it would otherwise be. Commerce is but an exchange of equivalents, and the quantity of food that must be given for a ton of iron is double what it would otherwise be. It is obvious that the food-producing community is taxed for the support of the idle and worthless members of the iron-producing community.

Second. That, in addition to all this, the iron-producing community is thus enabled to compel the food-producing community to be idle, when their labours are not needed on the farm, and to lose their crops for want of aid in harvest. It is obvious that here is a second tax imposed for the support of the non-workers among the producers of iron.

Third. That the scarcity of iron compels the food-producing community to use wagons and common roads when they might have railroads, and to give to the work of transportation ten days' labour instead of one. Here, again, we have a tax imposed for the support of the non-workers among the producers of iron. The food-producers are compelled to transport their products to a distance, and deprived of the power to make roads by which to do it.

Fourth. That the producers of food are compelled to employ more labour in building ships and wagons, and other perishable machinery, than would have been sufficient to build the furnaces and rolling mills, enduring machinery, required to give them all the iron they consumed. Here we have a fourth tax imposed for the support of the non-workers among the producers of iron.

Each one of these operations tends to diminish the number of equivalents that may be exchanged, the number of exchanges made, and the equivalent of a day's labour, in food, iron, or other of the comforts or conveniences of life, and the result is, that the product of labour is scarcely one-fifth of what it would be, were all productively employed.

These things premised, we may now examine the working of the colonial system.

Colonists are men who work. Of those who remain behind, a large portion do not work. Some live in poor-houses, and others in palaces. Some dance and sing, and others carry muskets. Some build ships of war, and others sail in them. The producers are few. The non-producers are many; yet they must eat, drink, wear clothing, and have houses, and these things must be provided for them by those who work. If all worked, the quantity of iron produced would be large, and those who produced food would get much iron in exchange. As few desire to work, and all must eat, the colonial system was invented for the purpose of compelling colonists to give much food and wool for little iron. The consequence has been everywhere the same.

While thus taxed for the maintenance of the money-spending classes, the colonists everywhere have been compelled to waste much labour, to work with poor machinery, and to give more of the products of labour for the use of that which is perishable than would have produced that which would endure almost for ever. Production is small. The equivalents to be exchanged are diminishing in number. Commerce is perishing.

The Irishman is compelled to waste much labour.\* He works with poor machinery. He gives half the product of his labour for the use of wagons and ships. He eats his crop of potatoes, and goes in rags. He has nothing to exchange.† He flies to America, and the number of exchanges to be made in Ireland, and from Ireland, is thus diminished.

The Hindoo flies from the valleys and plains to the hills, that he may escape from the system. Arrived at the hills, he finds no demand for his labour but in the cultivation of his little piece of land. He works with poor machinery, and his miserable product of fifty pounds of cotton to the acre is transported to Manchester, thence to be returned to him in the form of cloth, getting one pound for ten; and thus giving nine-tenths of his labour for the use of ships and wagons, perishable machinery, when one-fifth would have done the work at home, could he have had permanent machinery. He flies again, or he dies of famine and pestilence, or he sells himself as a slave, to go to Demerara; and thus is the number of the exchanges of India, and from India, diminished.

Men are everywhere flying from British commerce, which everywhere pursues them. Having exhausted the people of the lower lands of India, it follows them as they retreat towards the fastnesses of the Himalaya. Afghanistan is attempted, while Scinde and the Punjaub are subjugated. Siamese provinces are added to the empire of free trade, and war and desolation are carried into China, in order that the Chinese may be compelled to pay for the use of ships, instead of making looms. The Irishman flies to Canada; but there the system follows him, and he feels himself insecure until within this Union. The Englishman and the Scotchman try Southern Africa, and thence they fly to the more distant New Holland, Van Diemen's Land, or New Zealand. The farther they fly, the more they must use ships and other perishable machinery, the less steadily can their efforts be applied, the less must be the power of production, and the fewer must be the equivalents to be exchanged, and yet in the growth of ships, caused by such circumstances, we are told to look for evidence of prosperous commerce!

The British system is built upon cheap labour, by which is meant low

\* In 1842, three years before the potato rot, Ireland was thus described by an English traveller: "Throughout the south and west of Ireland, the traveller is haunted by the face of the *popular starvation*. It is not the exception—it is the *condition* of the people. In this fairest and richest of countries, men are suffering and *starving by millions*. There are thousands of them, at this minute, stretched in the sunshine at their cabin doors with *no work*, scarcely any food, no hope seemingly. Strong countrymen are lying in bed, '*for the hunger*'—because a man lying on his back does not need so much food as a person a-foot. Many of them have torn up the unripe potatoes from their little gardens, and to exist now must look to winter, when they shall have to suffer starvation and cold too."—*Thackeray. Irish Sketch Book*.

† People with whom starvation is "the condition" of life, consume little of that clothing which England furnishes in exchange for so much labour.

"Everywhere, throughout all parts, even in the best towns, and in Dublin itself, you will meet men and boys—not dressed, not covered—but hung round with a collection of rags of unrivalled variety, squalidity, and filth—walking dunghills. \* \* \* No one ever saw in English scarecrow with such rags."—*Quarterly Review*.

Transferred to this country, every one of these men would become a large consumer of food and cotton, and thus commerce would be increased.

priced and worthless labour.\* Its effect is to cause it to become from day to day more low priced and worthless, and thus to destroy production upon which commerce must be based. The object of protection is to produce dear labour, that is, high-priced and valuable labour, and its effect is to cause it to increase in value from day to day, and to increase the equivalents to be exchanged, to the great increase of commerce.

The object of what is now called free-trade is that of securing to the people of England the further existence of *the monopoly* of machinery, by aid of which Ireland and India have been ruined, and commerce prostrated. Protection seeks to *break down this monopoly*, and to cause the loom and the anvil to take their natural places by the side of the food and the cotton, that production may be increased, and that commerce may revive. How far it has tended here to produce that effect we may now examine.

Prior to the passage of the tariff of 1828, our exchanges of iron amounted to only 25 pounds per head. By 1832 they had increased to 46 pounds per head. Commerce thus had grown. From 1834 to 1841, they averaged 45 pounds per head. Commerce was stationary. In 1841 and '42, it fell to 38 pounds. Commerce had fallen with what was called free-trade. From 1844 to 1847, the equivalents of iron to be exchanged had increased to 97 pounds per head. Commerce had grown with protection. They are now 73 pounds per head. Commerce has fallen with the diminution of protection. If we turn now to coal, cotton, woollens, ships, or railroads, similar facts meet us everywhere. The number of exchanges grows with the system that looks to the elevation of the labourer. It diminishes with that which looks for its growth to the depression of the labourer. The interests of commerce are therefore in perfect harmony with those of manufactures and agriculture.

The one system repels population. The other attracts it, and hence it

\* The poor-silk weaver described in the following paragraph, which I take from the London *Spectator*, is the type of the system. He works so 'cheap' that he starves the poor Hindoo, and then starves himself. "His case *would not* be cured by protection." What he needs is the transfer of his labour from what is here called "production," but what is really only the conversion of the products of others, to that only thing which can be called production, and which consists in an increase of the *quantity* of commodities to be consumed. He merely changes their form from silk to silken cloth. Were his labours employed on any of the many millions of rich yet waste land within the kingdom, he would obtain more and better food, at less cost of labour. He could then feed better, and have more to offer in exchange. Commerce would then grow.

"Nearer to us, in the outlying parts of the metropolis, the traveller of 'The Morning Chronicle' describes regions where the people are hopelessly contending with a system of industry that is fostered by commerce, because it yields 'profit,' and is peopled, because it sometimes yields subsistence—the means of keeping body and soul together, though not always that. We know that the describer does not exaggerate. Many and many a man toils, with others of his family, from dark before the dawn until far into the next night, as long as human endurance will last, and *then* the produce of their industry falls short of subsistence. You say, 'it is a decaying trade.' It is not a decaying trade: read 'The Morning Chronicle,' and see how the workman makes silk which, in spite of free trade, not only beats the Frenchman out of the market, it is so good and so 'cheap,' but is further cheapened to bribe customers with reductions of prices filched from the wages of the miserable workman. Protection would not cure that man's case. Go round the district, stranger to you than Brussels, Lyons, or Genoa, and survey the dull, level aspect of poverty over all—poor workpeople, poor small tradesmen—a town of back streets. See the number of shops dealing in articles at second hand—not merely pawn-shops, but small cloth-dealers, traders in shop-marked stationery, dealers in apples that have seen better years in happier regions; the very grocery looks window-stained. Production, production, in a ceaseless round, but not enough subsistence for that sad nation; many things made and sold, and resold, but too few of them things to eat."



is that we see the whole people of Europe anxious to reach our shores. Abolish protection and immigration will cease, and commerce will diminish, for there will be less cloth and iron to be exchanged against labour. Make protection perfect and permanent, and immigration will increase rapidly, for there will be more cloth and iron to be exchanged against labour.

Were Ireland this day free, she would establish protection and thus arrest emigration. Food, and cloth, and iron, would become more abundant, and commerce would grow. Were Canada independent, she would establish protection, and then she would retain the immigrant coming from Ireland or England. Were India independent, she too would establish protection, and then the culture of cotton would be resumed on the rich lands of Bengal. In all these cases production would be increased, and the power to maintain commerce would grow. The people of the United States are the best customers to the people of England, because they are in some degree protected against the exhaustion consequent upon the existence of their system. Ireland cannot buy, and she is reduced to beg. Were she independent she would make iron, and then she could buy fine cloths, silks, books and pictures. The well-understood interests of all nations are in perfect harmony with each other.

The object of free trade is proclaimed to be the increase of commerce, but commerce withers under it. Ireland now consumes a pound of cotton per head. Transfer an Irishman here, and he will consume a dozen pounds, and 700,000 of her people would make more trade between the producers and consumers of cotton than is now maintained with the whole eight millions of Ireland. Were she free, she would adopt protection, and trade would grow, for she would then need six pounds per head. The commerce of the *Zollverein* has grown with protection. The people of Germany now consume two pounds of cotton where before they consumed but one. The commerce of India diminishes with every approach to what is called free trade. The producers of cotton on the lower lands of Bengal could have, as the equivalent of a day's labour, quadruple the iron that can be obtained now that the cultivator of that commodity has been driven to seek the high and poor lands.

The free trader, so called, says to the farmer, "You can have English iron in New York for thirty bushels of wheat, but you must hand over to the Treasury ten bushels for permission to make the exchange. If you take a ton of American iron, you must give to the producer of it forty bushels, and thus are you taxed ten bushels for the support of the iron man." Abolish protection and we shall have more food to sell abroad and more iron to buy abroad, and will need more wagons and ships, and it will then take sixty bushels of wheat—perhaps even one hundred—to pay for a ton of iron. The quantity to be exchanged will then fall to 20 pounds per head, and commerce will be diminished.

The farmer has his choice between giving *thirty* bushels for the support of the people who dance and sing and live in palaces, and that of those who carry muskets, or *ten* for the maintenance of the government under which he lives. The more he gives to the first, the more and the longer he must continue to give, the poorer he must grow, and the less will be the power to maintain commerce. That such is the case will be obvious from an examination of facts given in the last chapter. In the years from 1827 to 1834, 275,000,000 pounds of cotton would have purchased 1,250,000 tons of iron. In 1845-6, 600,000,000 were required to pay for 1,200,000 tons. What became of the difference? Were the English miners better clothed? On the contrary, it was but little before that time that it



was made known to the world that males and females worked together in the mines, absolutely naked. Was the condition of the people better? On the contrary, Ireland was fast becoming a great poor-house, and the poor-rates of England were fast advancing to the point they have now attained, that of £8,000,000 per annum. What then went with the difference? The question may be answered by pointing to the vast increase of public expenditure in the last fifteen years, during which the number of men who carry muskets and build ships of war has been so largely increased; to the innumerable and expensive commissions for ascertaining the causes of distress and pauperism; to the great fortunes of bankers and successful speculators; to men like Hudson, the rail-road king; to the large number who have in the late railroad speculation realized immense fortunes, as engineers, solicitors, counsellors and parliamentary agents, and to the host of others who fatten on the people. The productive power is diminishing, and the few become greater as the many become less. With every step in the progress of the latter, the power to maintain commerce diminishes, for the people become poorer, and the power to produce commodities to be given in exchange becomes more and more limited.

Whatever the occurrence that tends to diminish production, whether wars or revolutions, the increase of armies and fleets without the actual occurrence of war, or the increase of inequality, the few becoming richer and the many poorer, the effect is to impose a tax upon the consumers of the commodity the production of which is thus restrained. Under a system of real freedom of trade the chief portion of this tax would be paid by the actors themselves, for the immediate effect of such occurrences would be that of stimulating other nations to increased exertions to fill the vacuum that had been created. Under the system which gives to one nation a monopoly of the machinery for converting the products of other nations, a large portion of the tax may be, and is thrown upon them, and thus are they made to contribute largely towards the maintenance of all that class, poor and rich, who prefer to live by the labour of others.

We have seen that the quantity of cotton consumed in 1845 and '46 averaged 596,000,000 pounds, that the price of gray cloth was 6*s.* 7*d.*, and that 34,700,000 pieces delivered in Liverpool would have been required to pay for the cotton also delivered in Liverpool—all freights, charges, &c., being thus left for the planter to pay.

The average work of operatives in this country would be the conversion of 4000 pounds of cotton into cloth of this description. In England, we may set it down at 3000, and this would require 200,000 to convert the whole quantity. Allowing them to average even £30 each,\* the wages would amount to £6,000,000, and the product would be 92,000,000 of pieces, 35,000,000 of which would pay for the cotton, leaving 57,000,000

Worth	£19,000,000
From which deduct the labour performed, say,	6,000,000†

And there remain for interest, profits, &c., . . . £13,000,000

In order that large profits be realized, it is necessary that the price of the raw material be kept low; a state of things which results necessarily from the quantity requiring to be converted bearing a large proportion to the machinery prepared for its conversion. The mode of accomplishing this is simple. The first indication of a tendency to rise in the price is met by

\* The result of careful inquiry, in 1833, gave 10*s.* 5*d.* as the average of operatives, male and female, mechanics, engineers, &c. This would be £27, 1*s.* 8*d.* for the year.

† This is 2½*d.* per pound, which is much more than the truth.

working short hours, the effect of which is to diminish the wages of labour to a point so near the cost of food and rent, and taxes on both, that the power of purchasing clothing is almost destroyed; and therefore it is that we see such prodigious changes in home consumption whenever a small rise of prices takes place. The stock begins to accumulate, and with its accumulation the price falls. Mills again run full time, and so they continue until another rise takes place, when the same operation is performed, as is at this moment being the case.

The exchanger, owner of machinery, thus stands between the labourer who produces, and the labourer who consumes the cotton, fixing the price for both, and taking for himself the largest share; and thus it is that men accumulate colossal fortunes, while surrounded by men, women, and children living in poverty and clothed in rags.\* Of the burden thus thrown upon

\* Rothschild may be taken as the type of the whole system, and the following notice of him and of his modes of taxing those by whom he was surrounded, furnishes a picture of the speculators of every kind, in England, who live at the cost of the labourers of the world :—

“The name of Nathan Meyer Rothschild was in the mouths of all city men as a prodigy of success. Cautiously, however, did the capitalist proceed, until he had made a fortune as great as his future reputation. *He revived all the arts of an older period.* He employed brokers to depress or raise the market for his benefit, and is said in one day to have purchased to the extent of four millions. The name of Rothschild as contractor for an English loan made its first public appearance in 1819. But the twelve millions for which he then became responsible went to a discount. It was said, however, that Mr. Rothschild had relieved himself from all liability before the calamity could reach him. From this year his transactions pervaded the entire globe. The Old and the New World alike bore witness to his skill; and with the profits of a single loan he purchased an estate which cost £150,000. Minor capitalists, like parasitical plants, clung to him, and were always ready to advance their money in speculations at his bidding. Nothing seemed too gigantic for his grasp; nothing too minute for his notice. His mind was as capable of calculating a loan for millions as of *calculating the lowest possible amount on which a clerk could exist.* Like too many great merchants, whose profits were counted by thousands, *he paid his assistants the smallest amount for which he could procure them.* He became the high-priest of the temple of Janus, and the coupons raised by the capitalist for a despotic state were more than a match for the cannon of the revolutionist.

“From most of the speculations of 1824 and 1825, Mr. Rothschild kept wisely aloof. The Alliance Life and Fire Assurance Company, which owes its origin to this period, was, however, produced under his auspices, and its great success is a proof of his forethought. None of the loans with which he was connected were ever repudiated; and when the crash of that sad period came, the great Hebrew looked coldly and calmly on, and congratulated himself on his caution. At his counting-house, a fair price might be procured for any amount of stock, which, at a critical time, would have depressed the public market; and it was no uncommon circumstance for brokers to apply at the office of Mr. Rothschild, instead of going in the Stock Exchange. He has, however, been occasionally surpassed in cunning; and on one occasion a great banker lent Rothschild a million and a half on the security of consols, the price of which was then 84. The terms on which the money was lent were simple. If the price reached 74, the banker might claim the stock at 70; but Rothschild felt satisfied that, with so large a sum out of the market, the bargain was tolerably safe. The banker, however, as much a Jew as Rothschild, had a plan of his own. He immediately began selling the consols received from the latter, together with a similar amount in his own possession. The funds dropped; the Stock Exchange grew alarmed; other circumstances tended to depress it; the fatal price of 74 was reached; and the Christian banker had the satisfaction of outwitting the Hebrew loanmonger. But, if sometimes outwitted himself, there is little doubt he made others pay for it; and, on one occasion, it is reported that his finesse proved too great for the authorities of the Bank of England. Mr. Rothschild was in want of bullion, and went to the governor to procure on loan a portion of the superfluous store. His wishes were met; the terms were agreed on; the period was named for its return; and the affair finished for the time. The gold was used by the financier; his end was answered, and the day arrived on which he was to return the borrowed metal. Punctual to the time appointed, Mr. Rothschild entered; and those who remember his personal appearance may imagine the

the planter much goes to the payment of taxes for the maintenance of those who are reduced by the system to a state of pauperism—much to the government, which taxes every note, bill or bond—servants, horses, carriages, &c. &c. Vast sums go to the maintenance of lawyers and conveyancers, to that of stock-gamblers and speculators, and much is lost by failures of every kind, the natural results of a gambling trade. The result is, that the cotton which yields the planter, on his plantation, but five cents per pound, and is sold in Liverpool at four-pence halfpenny per pound, is sold by the mill owner at a shilling,\* and yet the reward of the labour employed in converting it into cloth is not two-pence, and probably little more than a penny per pound. It is so obviously the interest of mill owners to obtain large allowances for the use of machinery, that it cannot be doubted they will continue to pursue this course, and to make every effort that may be necessary to continue to themselves the control of the cotton market. That control depends upon continuing the monopoly of machinery; and the moment that monopoly shall be broken up, and machinery shall become so abundant elsewhere as to relieve the planter from the necessity for *seeking* a market, the power of taxation will pass away, cloth will be cheap, consumption will be trebled, and the producer will grow rich.

We may now, for a moment, look to the manner in which the sugar-planter is taxed. The quantity of sugar entered for home consumption in 1847 was 5,800,000 cwt., and the average price was about 25s. per cwt., of which at least one-fourth, and very probably one-third, went to pay the cost of transportation in and from India, the Isle of France, Brazil, Cuba, Jamaica, &c., storage, commission, &c.

Allowing it to have been three-tenths, the planter had at his command about £5,000,000

The price of iron was £9, 12s. and if we now add to this for the transportation to Cuba, Brazil, India, &c., and from the port to the plantation, only £1, 8s. we have £11 as the cost of a ton, at which rate 450,000 tons would amount to £4,950,000 and if the account were more accurately made up, it would not probably amount to 400,000 tons.

To add that quantity in a single year to the product of iron in this country, would not require the slightest exertion, and yet we see here that in return for it, small as it was, England obtained, in 1847, more than one-fourth of the products of the labour of all the sugar-producing countries of the globe! A very slight examination of this statement will show in what manner the people of the world are taxed for the maintenance of iron-manufacturers, railroad speculators, and the host of middle-men, with whom England so much abounds. Her producers are few, and her consumers are many, and the materials for their consumption are obtained by means of a system of taxation the most extraordinary that the world has yet seen.

The object of protection is not only to rescue ourselves from the necessity of contributing to the maintenance of such a system, but also to facilitate the process of emigration from lands so taxed, adding to the value of the people who remain, by diminishing the supply of men in market, and com-

cunning twinkle of his small, quick eye, as, ushered into the presence of the governor, he handed the borrowed amount in bank notes. He was reminded of his agreement, and the necessity of bullion was urged. His reply was worthy of a commercial Talleyrand. 'Very well, gentlemen. Give me the notes. I dare say your cashier will honour them with gold from your vaults, and then I can return you bullion.' To such a speech, the only worthy reply was a scornful silence."

\* The piece which sold at 6s. 7d. required to produce it about 6½ pounds of cotton. The price was thus almost exactly a shilling per pound.



selling those who desire to purchase labour to give for it the proper equivalent in food and raiment, which now they do not. With every step in that direction, their power to produce iron and to consume food and clothing must grow, and the power to maintain commerce must increase.

We have seen that iron was much more costly in 1845-6 than from 1827 to '34. In opposition to this unquestionable fact, the late Secretary of the Treasury asserted that, "experience proves that from improved machinery, new inventions and reduced cost of production, the foreign articles are constantly diminishing in price."\* In opposition to this we have the fact that not only was iron higher but cotton was lower. The man who gave two pounds of cotton in 1845-6 for less iron than he could have had in 1833-4 for one, found that the price of iron was increasing and not diminishing, and that it was far more difficult than in the former period to obtain what he needed for the construction of machinery. His wages in iron were thus reduced, and his power to accumulate capital was reduced; whereas, if he had made his exchanges on the spot with the producer of iron, both would have grown. Nevertheless we are told by the same authority that the necessary consequence of the protective system is, that "wages throughout the country became lower than before, because the aggregate profits of the capital of the nation engaged in all its industry is diminished."† It is deemed most profitable to trade with those nations whose labour is low, and the lower it is "the greater is our gain in the exchange." The labour of Great Britain is lower than it was fifteen years since, because it is less productive, and the less her people produce, the less they have to give us in exchange for our products; the consequence of which is, that we give more cotton for less iron. If all the people of England were to work, they would produce far more cloth and iron; wages would then rise, and the equivalent of a bale of cotton in iron would be doubled. The more productively the people of the world are employed, the greater will be the value of their labour, and the larger will be the quantity of good things that we shall obtain in exchange for our labour. The larger their armies, the more destructive their wars, the more numerous their revolutions, the more their money-spending classes, paupers and noblemen, abound, the smaller will be the value of labour abroad, the smaller will be their power to maintain commerce, and the smaller will be the advantage to those who trade with them; for the less silk or iron they produce, the more food or cotton must be given them as the equivalent of similar quantities.

The document to which I have above referred belongs to the school of discords; that which teaches to buy in the cheapest and sell in the dearest market, and sees great advantage to be gained by reducing the cotton of the poor Hindoo to a penny a pound, careless of the fact that famine and pestilence follow in the train of such a system. The policy that produces a *necessity* for depending on trade with people who are poorer than ourselves tends to reduce the wages of our labour to a level with theirs, and to diminish commerce. That which should give us *power* to trade with nations who might be richer than ourselves would tend to raise our wages to a level with theirs. By bringing the Irishman here, and enabling him to make his exchanges with us, we raise him to our level as a producer. By exporting our people to Ireland, and compelling them to make their exchanges there, we should sink their wages to a level with those of that country. The policy that brings people here and raises them in the scale of civilization, is that which promotes commerce. That which causes them to return home, and thus arrests the tide of immigration, preventing advance in civilization, is the one which diminishes commerce.

\* Report, December, 1848.

† Ibid.



## CHAPTER SEVENTH.

## HOW PROTECTION AFFECTS THE QUANTITY AND QUALITY OF THE MACHINERY OF PRODUCTION.

THE object sought to be accomplished is the improvement of the condition of man. The mode by which it is to be accomplished is that of increasing his productive power. The more food a man can raise, the more and better food may he consume, and the larger will be the surplus that can be appropriated to the purchase of clothing, to the education of his family, to the enlargement of his house, or to the improvement of his machinery, and the greater will be the amount of leisure that can be appropriated to the improvement of his modes of thought.

The better his machinery, and the more readily it can be obtained, the larger will be his production. Machinery consists chiefly of iron, and the more readily that can be obtained, the more rapid will be the increase of production and the improvement of the physical, moral, intellectual and political capacities of man. It is the great instrument of civilization.

The more durable his work, the more rapidly will his capital increase. Where iron is abundant it is substituted for wood in the building of houses, which are thus secured from fire, and in the construction of ships and roads, by which transportation is improved—and with each such step his powers of production are increased.

That he may obtain iron readily, he must have the command of fuel, obtainable at moderate cost of labour—in other words, cheaply—for things are cheap or dear not in proportion to their money-price, but to the quantity of labour required for obtaining them. The money-price of grain, in Ireland, is less than in England, yet the cost in labour is so great that the poor cultivator eats still poorer potatoes. The money-price of coal is less than it was two years since, yet the consumption has diminished, because the labour-price has risen. The money-price of cotton in those parts of India in which it is raised, is about two cents per pound, yet the man who raises it covers his loins with a rag, dispensing with clothing for the rest of his body, because the labour-price of cloth is great. Where production is small, the labour-price of commodities is high, and consumption is very small; and *vice versa*, where production is large, the labour-price of commodities is low, and consumption is great.

Large production requires good and cheap machinery, and that we may obtain such machinery, we must have good and cheap fuel. Abundance of fuel and iron are the foundation upon which civilization must rest, and whatever the course of policy that tends most to facilitate their acquisition, that is the one which must tend most rapidly to augment the productive power of man, and to increase his power and his capacity for improvement.

Iron ore and fuel exist throughout this country in such profusion as is elsewhere unknown. Nowhere in the world can they be so readily obtained—nowhere so easily brought into combination with each other. The anthracite of Pennsylvania is the best fuel in the world, and it can be mined as cheaply as any other. It is interstratified with iron ore in great abundance. Limestone abounds close to the great Schuylkill region, and it may be obtained with as little labour as anywhere in the world. The ores and fuel of Ohio and the West are thus described:—

The beds of ore are easy of access, being and associated with materials necessary for its reduction, cannot fail to be of immense sources of wealth. Most of the working-beds of ore are above the first workable bed of coal. The amount of workable ore in Muskingum county is estimated at 153,600,000 cubic yards, which, when melted, will yield about

half that number of tons, in pigs. We need not now speak of localities. Mr. Briggs closes his report on iron ore as follows:—"A very low calculation of the amount of good iron ore in the region which has this season been explored, is equal to a solid, unbroken stratum, sixty miles in length, sixty miles in width, and three feet in thickness. A square mile of this layer, being equivalent in round numbers to three millions cubic yards, when melted, will yield as many tons of pig iron. This number, multiplied by the number of square miles in the stratum, will give 1,080,000,000 tons; which, from three counties alone, will yield annually, for 2700 years, 400,000 tons of iron—more than equal to the greatest amount made in England previous to the year 1829."—*Ohio Paper*.

The country bordering on Carp River (Lake Superior) is, perhaps, the richest on the globe for its iron ore. The "Jackson Iron Company," whose location we had the pleasure of visiting, is situated some twelve miles from the Lake Shore, and about three miles from the iron mountains. One of these mountains belongs to the above-named company, and the other to the "Cleveland Iron Company." These two mountains, as we were informed, are by far the richest and most valuable of any iron deposit that have been discovered—though it is said that more or less iron ore is found spread over some seventeen or eighteen townships between Lake Superior and Green Bay. This ore contains from 75 to 90 per cent. of pure iron, and metal made from it by the Jackson Company has been submitted to the severest tests, and proves to be of the very best quality of iron that is made in any part of the world, having been drawn down to the size of No. 36 wire. The Jackson Iron Company (under the superintendence of P. M. Everett, Esq., who we now understand leaves, and is succeeded by Czar Jones, Esq., of Jackson) has been making iron for some twelve or eighteen months.—*Lake Superior News*.

Such being the case, we might suppose that the consumption of fuel and iron would be great, but such has not been the case.

In 1810, the domestic manufacture amounted to only 50,000 tons. In 1828, it had reached 100,000. In 1818, '19, '20, it may perhaps have reached 70,000, but even that is very doubtful. The total importation of bar and pig iron in those years was 40,000 tons, or 13,333 per annum. The import of manufactured articles of iron may have been half as much, and this would give a consumption of 90,000 tons, or 200,000,000 of pounds for a population of 9,400,000 persons, being a little over 20 pounds per head. The average consumption of the Union for all purposes, for house-building and ship-building, for agricultural implements, and for machinery of every description, was equal, therefore, to little more than twice the weight of an axe per head per annum, and yet there existed, as there now exists, a capacity to produce iron at less cost of labour than anywhere in the world. If we desire now to understand the cause of this, it may be found in the fact that up to the Revolution, the manufacture of iron, even that of horse-shoe nails, was prohibited, and there existed no inducement to erect works for the smelting of the ore, when the pig could not be used. The consequence was, that it did not grow with its natural growth, while that of England was forced forward, and when the day of nominal independence arrived, that of real independence was still far distant. Under the various tariffs from 1789 to 1812, the duties were ad-valorem, commencing with  $7\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. and gradually rising until they had attained, before the war of 1812,  $17\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. The production of iron had made no progress, and the whole supply had to be sought abroad, the consequence of which was that it was scarce and dear. Embargo, non-intercourse, and war raised the price so high that furnaces were built in considerable numbers; but with the peace, the duties on manufactured iron were reduced to 20 per cent. The demand for pig iron was thus diminished, and the price in Pittsburgh, which had been \$60, fell in 1820 and 1821 to \$20, the consequence of which was the ruin of nearly all engaged in its production. This, however, was not a consequence of reduction of duty. At that very time the duty on pigs was \$10, and on bars \$30 per ton, and thus the selling price at that place was *far less than the freight and duty on imported iron*. Iron was nominally cheap, but

really dear: so dear that consumption was destroyed. Labour was at \$6 per month, and wheat sold for 25 cents a bushel, and thus was produced so total an inability to consume this most necessary of all commodities, that although the furnaces were closed, the whole import of pig and rolled iron in 1821, was but 4000 tons, or one ton to every 2,500 persons. It may be doubted if the consumption of that year exceeded six pounds per head. We see thus that the power to import disappeared with the power to produce, as has already been shown to have been the case on other occasions.

Who, now, were the losers by the greatly increased difficulty of obtaining this great instrument of civilization? To answer this question, we must first inquire who are the great consumers of iron? The farmers and planters constitute three-fourths of the population of the nation, and if the loss were equally distributed, that portion of the loss would fall upon them: but we shall find upon inquiry that it is upon them, the producers of all we consume, that the whole of it must fall.

The farmer needs iron for his spades and ploughs, his shovels and his dung-forks, his trace-chains and horse-shoes, and his wagon-wheels; for his house, his barn, and his stable. He needs them, too, for his timber. If iron be abundant, saws are readily obtained, and the saw-miller takes his place by his side, and he has his timber converted into plank at the cost of less labour than was before required to haul the logs to the distant saw-mill. He obtains the use of mill-saws cheap. If iron be abundant, the grist-mill comes to his neighbourhood, and now he has his grain converted into flour, giving for the work less grain than was before consumed by the horses and men employed in carrying it to the distant mill. If iron be abundant, spades and picks are readily obtained, and the roads are mended, and he passes more readily to the distant market. If iron increase in abundance, the railroad enables him to pass with increased facility, himself, his turnips and potatoes, to markets from which before he was entirely shut out by cost of transportation, except as regarded articles of small bulk and much value—wheat and cotton. If iron be abundant, the woollen-mill comes, and his wool is converted on the spot by men who eat on the ground his cabbages and his veal, and drink his milk, and perform the work of conversion in return for services and things that would have been lost had they not been thus consumed. At each step he gets the use of iron cheaper—that is, at less cost of labour. If iron be abundant, the cotton-mill now comes, and the iron road now brings the cotton, and his sons and his daughters obtain the use of iron spindles and iron looms by which they are enabled to clothe themselves at one-twentieth of the cost of labour that had been necessary but twenty years before. Instead of a yard of cotton received in return for two bushels of corn, one bushel of corn pays for six yards of cloth—and now it is that the farmer grows rich.

A careful examination of society will satisfy the inquirer that all the people engaged in the work of transportation, conversion, and exchange, are but the agents of the producers, and live out of the commodities they produce, and that the producers grow rich or remain poor precisely as they are required to employ less or more persons in the making of their exchanges. The farmer who is compelled to resort to the distant mill employs many persons, horses and wagons, in the work of converting his grain into flour, and his land is of small value. Bring the mill close to him, and a single horse and cart, occasionally employed, will do the work. The farmer who employs the people of England to produce his iron, is obliged to have the services of numerous persons, of ships and wagons, and horses, to aid in the work. Bring the furnace to his side, and let his neighbour get out his iron, and he and his sons do much of the work themselves, furnishing



timber, ore, and the use of horses, wagons, &c., when not needed on the farm.

The man of Tennessee sends to market 300 bushels of corn, for which he receives in return one ton of iron, the money-cost of which is \$60, but the labour-cost of which is the cultivation of ten acres of land. If he could follow his corn, he would find that the men who get out his iron receive but 30 or 40 bushels, and that the remaining 260 or 270 are swallowed up by the numerous transporters and exchangers that stand between himself and the men whom he thus employs. If, now, he could bring those men to his side, giving them double wages, say sixty bushels of corn, he would be a gainer to the extent of 240 bushels. While he has to give 300 bushels, his iron is dear, and he can use little. When he obtains it for 60 bushels it is cheap, and he uses much. His production increases, and his ability to use iron increases with it, and the demand for workers in iron increases, and all obtain food more readily, the consequence of which is that they have more to spare for clothing, and for other of the comforts or the luxuries of life.

Whenever there is in market a surplus of any commodity, the whole quantity tends to fall to the level of the lowest price required to enable the holders to find purchasers, and so long as we shall continue to have a surplus of food for export, the price of the whole must continue to be regulated by that which can be obtained for the trivial quantity sent to Liverpool.

Whenever it is necessary to resort to distant places to procure a part of the supply of any commodity, the price of the whole is regulated by the cost of obtaining this last small portion. In 1847, we produced 800,000 tons of iron, yet the demand was so much in advance of the supply that we were obliged to import a small quantity, and the price at which that was obtained fixed the price of the whole. The farmer is thus always selling in the cheapest and buying in the dearest market. The labour and capital required to produce a ton of iron, are not as great as are needed for the production of forty bushels of corn, and yet he gives for it three hundred, because of the quantity of labour wasted in transporting the one to the man who produces the other.

The prices of labour and iron are both higher than in Europe, and therefore we import both. The price of food is lower than in Europe, and therefore we export it. Whenever the import of labour shall be such as to do away with the *necessity* for exporting food, as food, its price will be high, and we shall cease to export it. Whenever the import of men shall be such as to do away with the *necessity* for importing iron, the price will be low, and we shall export food in the form of iron. By the same operation the farmer will thus be enabled to obtain high prices for his grain, and to buy his iron cheap. He will then buy in the cheapest and sell in the dearest market, and the value of his labour will be increased.

We have seen that in the period that elapsed between 1821 and 1829, embracing the six years which followed the passage of the act of 1824, the consumption of iron rose to about 25 pounds per head. In the three following years, under the tariff of 1828, it rose to 47. By the Compromise Act, the duty on railroad iron was abolished, and the consequence was, that the power of consumption diminished, remaining at an average of but 46 pounds for the next nine years. Under the strictly revenue clauses of the tariff it fell to 38 pounds, being less than the consumption of eleven years before. By 1846, it had risen to 94, and in the following year it rose to 98. Who were the persons that benefited by this change? Let us see. The abundance of iron facilitated the opening of coal mines by means of steam-engines and other machinery, and the making of roads, by means of which coal, and food,



and timber could be taken to market, and thus greatly diminished the number of persons intermediate between the producer and consumer; and the abundance of fuel and iron facilitated the construction of steamboats, diminishing greatly the cost of transportation to and from market; and facilitated the construction of mills and furnaces, at which the farmers and planters could make their own exchanges; while the increased facility of obtaining ploughs and harrows, spades and axes, tended to increase the productiveness of labour, with large increase in the quantities to be exchanged, and in this manner the whole benefit resulting from the augmented facility of obtaining iron went to the cultivators of the land, farmers and planters.

But why should protection have been necessary to produce this result? To the general reasons already given, may now be added, those which refer particularly to iron. In a table now before me,\* the English prices of merchant-bar iron are thus given:—

£	s.	£	s.	£	s.	£	s.	£	s.	£	s.
1816—11	0 @	8	15	1827—	9 10 @	8	15	1837—10	5 @	6	15
1817—	8 10 @	13	0	1828—	9 0 @	7	15	1838—	9 10 @	9	15
1818—12	0 @	10	0	1829—	7 10 @	6	12	1839—10	5 @	9	10
1819—11	10 @	11	0	1830—	6 15 @	6	5	1840—	9 0 @	8	0
1820—10	10 @	9	10	1831—	6 5 @	5	17	1841—	7 15 @	0	0
1821—	9 10 @	8	15	1832—	6 5 @	5	10	1842—	6 10 @	5	5
1822—	8 10 @	8	0	1833—	6 15 @	7	15	1843—	5 0 @	4	10
1824—13	0 @	8	15	1834—	6 10 @	7	12	1844—	6 6 @	5	0
1825—15	0 @	11	10	1835—	8 5 @	6	5	1845—	6 10 @	9	0
1826—11	0 @	9	10	1836—11	10 @	10	5	1846—	9	0	

We have here £4 10=\$21 60, and £15=\$72, and every price between. Why should these enormous variations take place? It costs no more labour to make iron at one time than at another. The man who mined a ton of ore or coal in 1832, when the price was £5 10, could mine more than a ton in 1846, because machinery had been greatly improved, and yet the price was then £9.

The season may be adverse for the growth of grain or cotton, and the rot may destroy the potato crop, thus diminishing the quantity to be supplied with great increase of price, and yet neither food nor cotton is liable to the enormous and sudden changes that we see in regard to iron, which ought to be perfectly steady. These changes are due to the unsound character of the system, and the perpetual changes that result therefrom. The consequence of them is, the constant recurrence of ruin to all, in other countries engaged in the manufacture of iron. In 1816 it was high, and furnaces were built. In 1821, it was low, and iron-masters were everywhere ruined. In 1825 it was high, and furnaces were again put in blast. In 1831, furnace-masters were again ruined. In 1836 it was high, and in 1842, it was low, and on both occasions the same operations were repeated. So again in 1846, furnaces were built, and now, in 1849, they are being closed.

The consequence of this is that the iron manufacture throughout the country is in a barbarous condition. Small furnaces abound, at which much labour is given to producing little iron. At each forced intermission of the exertions of England to maintain the monopoly of the production of this important commodity, we can see it making its way gradually to the land where alone it can be produced at small cost of labour—that land where ore, coal and limestone are interstratified with each other, and at which it would long since have arrived but for our frequent changes of policy.

\* Merchants' Magazine, Vol. XX. p. 337.

Very little examination is necessary to satisfy the inquirer that it has been precisely when iron has been lowest in England, in 1822 and 1843, that our consumption was least; and it is now diminishing rapidly, as our furnaces are being closed and their owners ruined. *The power to consume declines daily.* With another year or two the price abroad will be high, but time will then be required to get the old furnaces into operation, and still longer to build new ones; for iron-making is like buying lottery tickets, and the blanks are more numerous than the prizes. That time arrived, pig iron may be again \$40 and bars \$80 per ton.

So long as a nation is dependent on England for any portion of its supply, so long must prices continue to be thus variable, and so long must the consumption of this important article, and the facilities for producing it, be small, and all the deficiency falls on the producer of food, or wool, or cotton; for it is he that pays the cost of transportation, conversion and exchange. The consumption of the present year will not, probably, exceed 700,000 tons, for the make at home is greatly diminished, and the stock on hand has increased to an extent nearly approaching that of the import from abroad. Next year, there is strong reason for believing that it will be still farther diminished, whereas, there can be no doubt that that year, had the system of 1842 remained unchanged, would have seen the domestic product attain 1,300,000 tons, or 3,000,000,000 of pounds, being 125 pounds per head; the *increase* for 1846 having been almost equal to the whole consumption, per head, in 1842-3. Thenceforth, the price would have been regulated by the cost of production here, and not by the fluctuations of policy abroad; and thenceforth the prices would have been daily diminishing, as the machinery of production improved. The object of the colonial system is that of increasing the number of transporters, converters and exchangers, who are to be supported out of the labours of the farmers and planters. The object of the protective system is to diminish the number; and the question now to be settled is, whether the labourers, the men who produce all that we consume, or the exchangers shall be masters. Were the latter to succeed, we should have perfect freedom of trade, so far as freedom consists in being compelled to forego the association of men with their fellow-men for the improvement of their condition, and the result would be the stoppage of every furnace in the Union; when all those engaged in mining coal and ore would be compelled to resort to the raising of food, which would be lower, while iron would be higher and greatly higher. Its cost in labour would be so far increased that consumption would fall to the point at which it stood in 1821. Perfect protection would soon quadruple our production, and vast numbers of persons would mine iron and coal instead of raising food, which would be higher. The labour-cost of iron would be diminished, and the consumption would be increased; and it is by aid of iron that production is to be increased, exchanges facilitated, conversion improved, land increased in value, and farmers and planters made rich.

---

From 1829 to 1832, the domestic production increased about fifty per cent. During the whole of that period, the Union was agitated by threats of nullification and disunion, and there existed no motive for investing in furnaces or rolling-mills the large amounts required for the cheap production of this important commodity. From 1842 to 1847, the production trebled, and perhaps quadrupled. During the intermediate period it was almost stationary.

I propose to inquire what would have been the result, had the production gone on to increase at the rate of only 15 per cent. per annum, and then to examine what would have been the effect on the working men, the planters and

farmers of the Union, with a view to ascertain from the experience of the past what is probably the true course of policy for the future.

Starting with 200,000 tons in 1832, and increasing the product 15 per cent, the succeeding years would have been as follows:—

Years.	1000 tons.	Years.	1000 tons.	Years.	1000 tons.
1833 . .	230	1839 . .	532	1845 . .	1230
1834 . .	265	1840 . .	612	1846 . .	1415
1835 . .	305	1841 . .	704	1847 . .	1630
1836 . .	350	1842 . .	810	1848 . .	1875
1837 . .	402	1843 . .	930	1849 . .	2150
1838 . .	462	1844 . .	1070	1850 . .	2472

It will be seen that the highest increase of any year is scarcely more than that which actually took place in years between 1843 and 1847, when every thing had to be recommenced, after a state of almost utter ruin. What now would have been the amount of investment required for the production of this quantity of pig-metal? A furnace capable of producing 5000 tons per week may cost \$30,000. We can now produce 800,000 tons. To have made it 2,000,000 would have required the building of 240 furnaces more than we have built, and their construction would have required \$8,000,000, being far less than the amount that has in that period been spent in *building* packet ships to run between New York, London, and Liverpool,—leaving out of view all other expenditure upon shipping, whether for building or sailing them. The ships have disappeared, or will disappear, leaving nothing behind. The furnaces would be still in existence. At one establishment in Pennsylvania there are six furnaces capable of producing 800 tons of metal per week, or 41,600 tons per annum. The cost of these may have been \$200,000. To build ships capable of transporting that quantity would require an investment of at least \$750,000. At the end of a few years, the whole of that capital would be sunk, while the furnaces might last almost for centuries. The tendency of the colonial system is thus to compel the employment of capital in temporary machinery, and the object of protection is to enable the owner of it to invest it in that which is permanent.

It will be asked, what should we have done with all this iron? In answer, I say, that every man is a consumer to the full extent of his production. The man who made the iron would have required food, fuel and clothing. The man who mined the fuel would have required iron, food and clothing. The man who raised the food would have required iron, fuel and clothing. The man who made the clothing would have required iron, food and fuel. The man who raised the wool and the cotton would have required food, fuel, iron, and clothing. Production would have largely increased, and there would have been a large increase in the power of consuming all the commodities necessary for the convenience and comfort of man. In other words, there would have been a great increase in the profits of capital and the wages of labour.

Had production gone on at the rate I have indicated, we should have in the period from 1834 to the present time 15,000,000 of tons, whereas we have had but 5,000,000. These 10,000,000 would have filled the country with machinery, enabling the farmers and planters to have the consumers by their sides, and in addition would have given them roads by which to go to market at half the present cost. Their necessity for going to distant markets would have diminished, while their power so to do would have increased, and with every step in this progress they would have become enriched.

It may, perhaps, be said that this demand for labour would have dimin-



ished the power to produce food and cotton. On the contrary, it would have increased it. Two-thirds of the labour actually employed in the making of this iron and its conversion into the various forms to fit it for use, would have been saved labour—labour that has been wasted. Further, the farmer and planter would have exchanged their food and cotton on the spot for iron, and here would have been a further and vast saving of labour. The increased facility of obtaining spades and hoes, ploughs and harrows, horse-shoes, carts and wagons, would have rendered the labour on the farm or plantation more productive. The rapid growth of railroads would have prevented the necessity for going to market with produce, and facilitated the transport of manure, and marl, and lime, and thus the power to apply labour steadily and advantageously would have largely increased. The neighbouring cotton-mill or woollens-mill would have furnished clothing for food and labour, and thus the necessity for looking to distant markets would have been diminished, while the power to resort to them would have largely increased. The increased demand for labour and its increased reward, would have tended largely to augment immigration, and each new arrival would have been a mouth to be fed and a back to be clothed, to the advantage of both farmer and planter. Farms and plantations would have been divided, and more food and cotton would have been obtained from small ones than are now obtained from large ones. The land would have increased in value, and the farmers and planters would have grown rich because of increased production and diminished cost of exchange, and a part of the surplus would have been appropriated to the purchase of books and newspapers, and musical instruments and pictures, and thus would intellectual have kept pace with moral and physical improvement. Instead of all this, the period from 1835 to 1843 was one of diminished production and increasing poverty and crime, ending with bankruptcy and repudiation.

What has been said in regard to iron is equally true in regard to coal, but it is unnecessary to go into detail. Had the tariff of 1828 been adopted as the settled policy of the nation, the consumption of anthracite would by this time have reached 10,000,000 of tons, and the vast coal fields of the West would likewise be giving forth their products by millions, and thus the food of the farm would have been condensed into fuel and iron, fitting it for transportation, and providing means of transportation. Instead of this, we have had a series of changes that have involved in ruin almost all that have been largely interested in giving to the nation the extraordinary works that connect Philadelphia and New York with the great coal region of Pennsylvania, and State bankruptcy and repudiation have been followed by that of companies which have done more for the real advantage of the Union than any others that have ever existed within its limits, and all this has been produced by a policy under which the whole consumption of iron was reduced below 40 pounds per head, when it might long since have reached 300.

Had the production of iron and coal been allowed to increase, and the manufacture of cotton to grow, we should be now consuming a million and a half of bales; and had the woollens manufacture been allowed to grow, we should now have a hundred millions of sheep, the whole of whose wool would be required for our domestic consumption, for those who produce largely consume largely.

The perfect harmony of interests is nowhere more perfectly exhibited than in a thorough examination of the course of proceeding in relation to both coal and iron. Both were heavily protected from 1816 to 1824, but neither grew, because the iron *manufacture*, the cotton and the woollen manufactures, did not grow; and so would it now be, were iron and coal protected at the cost of cotton and wool. All wax and wane together, and the



man who would protect himself at the cost of his neighbour, makes a sad mistake. It is useless to produce iron without a market, and that market is to be found in the rolling-mill, the foundery, the machine-shop, the cutler's shop and that of the axe-maker, and they in turn must find a market among the producers of food, and wool, and cotton. The shipwright uses largely of iron, and that he may do so, there must be a large market for sugar, tea, coffee, and other of the luxuries and comforts of life. The larger the market, the larger will be the consumption of iron, and the larger the latter, the more rapidly will the former grow. In a wise political economy there will be found no discords.

## CHAPTER EIGHTH.

### HOW PROTECTION AFFECTS POPULATION.

COMBINATION of action is indispensable to increase in the value of labour. The first cultivator can neither roll nor raise a log, with which to build himself a house. He makes himself a hole in the ground, which serves in lieu of one. He cultivates the poor soil of the hills to obtain a little corn, with which to eke out the supply of food derived from snaring the game in his neighbourhood. His winter's supply is deposited in another hole, liable to injury from the water which filters through the light soil into which alone he can penetrate. He is in hourly danger of starvation. At length, however, his sons grow up. They combine their exertions with his, and now obtain something like an axe and a spade. They can sink deeper into the soil; and can cut logs, and build something like a house. They obtain more corn and more game, and they can preserve it better. The danger of starvation is diminished. Being no longer forced to depend for fuel upon the decayed wood which alone their father could use, they are in less danger of perishing from cold in the elevated ground which, from necessity, they occupy. With the growth of the family new soils are cultivated, each in succession yielding a larger return to labour, and they obtain a constantly increasing supply of the necessities of life from a surface diminishing in its ratio to the number to be fed; and thus with every increase in the return to their labour the power of combining their exertions is increased.

If we look now to the solitary settler of the West, even where provided with both axe and spade, we shall see him obtaining, with extreme difficulty, the commonest log hut. A neighbour arrives, and their combined efforts produce a new house with less than half the labour required for the first. That neighbour brings a horse, and he makes something like a cart. The product of their labour is now ten times greater than was that of the first man working by himself. More neighbours come, and new houses are wanted. A "bee" is made, and by the combined effort of the neighbourhood the third house is completed in a day; whereas the first cost months, and the second weeks, of far more severe exertion. These new neighbours have brought ploughs and horses, and now better soils are cultivated and the product of labour is again increased, as is the power to preserve the surplus for winter's use. The path becomes a road. Exchanges begin. The store makes its appearance. Labour is rewarded by larger returns, because aided by better machinery applied to better soils. The town grows up. Each successive addition to the population brings a consumer and a producer. The shoemaker wants leather and corn in exchange for his shoes. The blacksmith requires fuel and food, and the farmer wants shoes for his horses; and with the increasing facility of exchange more labour is applied to production, and the reward of labour rises, producing new wants, and requiring more and larger exchanges. The road becomes

a turnpike, and the wagon and horses are seen upon it. The town becomes a city, and better soils are cultivated for the supply of its markets, while the railroad facilitates exchanges with towns and cities more distant. The tendency to union and to combination of exertion thus grows with the growth of wealth. In a state of extreme poverty it cannot be developed. The insignificant tribe of savages that starves on the product of the upper soil of hundreds of thousands of acres of land, looks with jealous eyes on every intruder, knowing that each new mouth requiring to be fed tends to increase the difficulty of obtaining subsistence; whereas the farmer rejoices in the arrival of the blacksmith and the shoemaker, because they come to eat on the spot the corn which heretofore he has carried ten, twenty, or thirty miles to market, to exchange for shoes for himself and his horses. With each new consumer of his products that arrives he is enabled more and more to concentrate his action and his thoughts upon his home, while each new arrival tends to increase his *power* of consuming commodities brought from a distance, because it tends to diminish his *necessity* for seeking at a distance a market for the produce of his farm. Give to the poor tribe spades, and the knowledge how to use them, and the power of association will begin. The supply of food becoming more abundant, they hail the arrival of the stranger who brings them knives and clothing to be exchanged for skins and corn; wealth grows, and the habit of association—the first step towards civilization—arises.

It is not good for man to live alone, and yet throughout this country, we find thousands and tens of thousands of men flying to the West, there to commence the work of cultivation at a distance from their fellow-men, while millions upon millions of acres of rich land in the old States remain untouched. If, now, we refer to the course of events during the last thirty years, we see that the tendency to migration increased rapidly between 1834 and 1842, when the building of mills and furnaces ceased, and that during that period we colonized Texas and Oregon. In the years which followed, the tendency to emigrate diminished, to break out afresh under the influence of the policy of 1846. The last twelve months have witnessed the departure of very many thousands to California, Santa Fe, &c., while the emigration to Iowa, Wisconsin, and other portions of the extensive West, is entirely without precedent.

"It is estimated," says the editor of one of the Iowa papers,

"That between fourteen and fifteen hundred wagons have crossed the Mississippi at this place, within the last five weeks, bringing emigrants from Ohio, Indiana and Illinois, and all of them seeking homes in Iowa. They have," says he, "generally gone to the new counties on and west of the Des Moines river, where, we know, they will find lands and other agricultural advantages, equal to any in the world. Allowing five persons to a wagon, there have crossed at this place alone, between 7000 and 8000 persons. We are told that the same extraordinary influx of immigrants has taken place at all the other crossings along the river Dubuque, down to Keokuk. It is, therefore, reasonable to suppose that from 30,000 to 50,000 persons have been added to our population within the last month and a half, and the tide is still pressing towards us."\*

If we desire to find the reason for the extraordinary tendency now prevailing to seek the West, it may be found in the diminishing value of labour in the older States. The production of iron, coal, cotton and woollen cloths, and of commodities generally, has diminished; and there is not only no demand for labour in the construction of new mills and furnaces, or in the opening of new coal mines, but the number of persons employed is actually diminished. The natural increase of our population is almost 600,000, and the immigration of the present year is about 300,000; and thus 900,000

\* Burlington (Iowa) Gazette.

persons are added, while the number that can find employment in the old States is less than it was two years since. All these people must eat, and if they cannot obtain food in exchange for labour, employed in the mining of coal or manufacture of cloth or iron, they must raise it for themselves, and hence it is that the population of the new States grows now so rapidly.

Here is a case of apparent discord. The people of the new States need neighbours to help them to make roads and build churches and school-houses, and the state of things that injures the farmers of Pennsylvania, New York and Virginia, benefits all those who are already in Wisconsin and Iowa. They profit by free-trade and would be injured by protection. Strange as it may seem, however, directly the reverse is the case. The harmony of interests is perfect, and the discord is only apparent. The new States would grow faster under protection than they now do under free-trade. But for the abolition of protection, in 1832-3, Iowa, Wisconsin, &c., would now be populous States, as I propose now to show. From 1821 to 1825, there existed no inducement for emigration from Europe to this country. Wages here were low, and the difficulty of obtaining employment was great. The average number of immigrants was but 7138, and the last year was little more than the average. By 1829, it reached 24,000. Five years after, (1834,) it was 65,000. The average of the next nine years was but 72,000; and, in the last of those years, it was but 75,179. Like every thing else, immigration was stationary. In the four following years it was trebled. This year it may reach 230,000. It has already begun to decline.

It is obvious that the demand for labour grows with increase in the number of modes in which it can be applied; and that with every step in that direction the return to labour increases, enabling the labourer to obtain larger wages—that is to say, more food, fuel, clothing, books and newspapers, and greater facilities for the education of his children, in return to the same labour. We see that the power to obtain these good things increased rapidly from 1830 to 1834, and that the effect was to produce a vast increase of immigration. With every such increase there must, necessarily, have been increased power of combination, accompanied by increased facilities for obtaining the things for which men are willing to labour; offering new attractions for the labourer, and producing a further increased tendency in the same direction. In a former chapter, I have supposed that it might by this time have reached 1,000,000 per annum, and that it would have done had it doubled but once in four years. A duplication in three years would have brought it by this time to 2,000,000. Taking it, however, at the former quantity, we should have imported in the intermediate period nearly 6,000,000, instead of less than 2,000,000. If we now add thereto the natural increase of all these people, we would have at this moment a population exceeding by at least 5,000,000 the number we now have; and of these, while vast numbers would have been employed in giving value to the lands of the older States, by opening mines and building furnaces, millions would have sought the West, the access to which would have been rendered daily more and more easy by the increased facility of obtaining iron for the construction of steam-boats and rail-roads.

The large immigration of the last and previous years is by many ascribed to the troubles in Europe; but their effect has been small. All commodities tend to seek the best market, and to this rule labour forms no exception. The people of Europe are anxious to transfer themselves here because man is here a commodity of more value than in Europe, and can obtain more food, fuel and clothing, and better shelter, in return for the same quantity of labour, than he can at home; and the more widely extended the knowledge that such is the fact, the greater is the anxiety to reach our shores. Had



the demand for labour continued to increase as it did from 1844 to 1847, the immigration of the present year would probably far exceed even half-a-million; whereas, there is every reason to believe that there will be a great diminution.

## CHAPTER NINTH.

### HOW PROTECTION AFFECTS THE MEANS OF TRANSPORTATION—INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL.

THE more widely men are separated, the greater is the difficulty attendant on the making of roads, and the greater is the quantity of labour lost to the farmer in performing the work of transportation, and the poorer he remains. The more men are enabled to combine their exertions, the greater is the facility of obtaining roads; the less the labour lost in transportation, the more can be given to the work of production, and the richer will the farmer grow.

During the years from 1835 to 1840, the tendency was to separation, and there was great need of roads. The widely scattered settlers of Illinois, Indiana, Michigan and Mississippi could not make them of themselves, and none would trust them individually with the means necessary for their construction. To remove this difficulty, they united in borrowing the food and clothing and the iron required for the purpose, pledging the faith of the State for payment of the cost, and the result was universal ruin. Men were scattering themselves, and labour was becoming less productive; the consequence of which was, that immigration ceased to increase; and *it was precisely when the growth of population from that source was arrested*, that we were extending the area of settlement, and diminishing the power of combining exertion for the purpose of increasing the return to labour.

We are now doing precisely the same thing. Men are scattering themselves widely, and there is a great demand for roads. The papers from day to day inform us of the new ones that are being made in the West with iron that is obtained in exchange for certificates of debt, bearing interest, that must be paid. The men who should be making iron are seeking the West, and borrowing the iron they should be making, and, if the system be long continued, the result must be the same that was witnessed in 1842-3.

It is to this unnatural expansion of a small population over large surfaces that is due the agitation, of the question of improvement by the general government, one of the most dangerous now remaining to be settled. If the settlement and cultivation of new lands, and the formation of new States, proceeded naturally, the population would become sufficiently rich to be enabled to make their own roads and improve their own harbours; but as that cannot be the case under the existing system, they look to the government for aid. At this moment, it is proposed that a vast amount of land should be given, or sold at a very low price, to aid in the making of a road to California, a work that, if prosecuted with vigour, would be finished half a century before it would pay interest on its cost, because it would tend only to promote the further dispersion of population, and the further diminution in the productiveness of labour. We need concentration to render labour more productive, and to promote immigration; and if that be obtained, the natural and profitable settlement of the country beyond the Mississippi will go on so rapidly as to insure a connection with the Pacific, with advantage to all, in a very reasonable time. It is doubtful if there is a single instance on record of a road having been made with a view to attract population, or one that has been altogether dependent on *through* travel and trade, as this must for a long time be, that has not proved a failure. To make roads productive, they must pass through countries where men consume on the land a good portion of the products of the land, and grow rich, and not through

those in which, because of the absence of consuming population, every thing that is raised on the land is sent from the land, and its owners remain poor. If this road be now made, there will be great loss somewhere, and fall where it may, it will be a loss to the community.

The reason why such roads are unprofitable is, that the transportation upon them is almost entirely limited to bulky articles that must be carried at low freights. The most valuable of all commodities is man, and upon such roads the travel is small, for the people are poor, and must remain at home. Their products pay little to the road, yet the little that is left purchases but little of silk, or cloth, or other of the articles of merchandise upon which high tolls can be charged. Where, on the contrary, there is a large consuming population on the line, the way-travel is great, and the commodities that pass to market pay good freights, while the balance pays for much merchandise to be returned.

Applying these views to the means of intercourse with foreign nations, we may now, I think, see why it is that shipping grows with protection.

The merchandise we send to Europe is bulky, and the returns are compact, a consequence of which is that the outward cargo has generally had to bear almost all the charges of the voyage.

From 1830 to 1834, the reward of labour was, however, such as induced a great increase of immigration, and thus was secured a valuable return cargo, the receipts from which tended largely to diminish the charges on outward freights, and thus the planter and farmer were enabled to consume more largely of the merchandise of Europe, which pays high freights, and more of tea and coffee, while the demand for the raw materials used in manufactures, also enabled ships to bring them as part of their return cargoes, facilitating the transmission of our produce and merchandise to other parts of the world.

From 1835 to 1844, immigration was almost stationary. So was shipping. From 1845 to the present time immigration has grown rapidly. So has shipping. We now import 300,000 persons, and the usual allowance being two persons to five tons, it follows that shipping to the extent of 250,000 tons, making three trips per annum, is so employed. Freights to Europe are low, because the return cargo is large and valuable. Ships of the first class are now built expressly for the importation of men, and so will they continue to be, if the number of passengers shall continue to increase. With a diminution of it, the building of ships will diminish, and freights to Europe will rise, because a valuable return cargo cannot then be calculated upon. The rise of freights will, as a matter of course, diminish the number of articles that will bear exportation, and the quantity of merchandise that can be imported from Europe, while the diminution in the number of mouths requiring tea, coffee, and other similar commodities, will tend still further to diminish the tendency towards the building of ships.

Were we now importing a million of people, the shipping required for that purpose alone would be 830,000 tons, and freights to Europe would be almost nominal, for great numbers would go altogether in ballast. Whatever tends to increase the bulk of the commodities imported tends equally to diminish the cost of transportation, and to increase the export of the products of the farmer and planter. If we imported raw silk, we should import Frenchmen to manufacture it, and coffee for them to drink, and the ships that imported the silk, the men, and the coffee, would cheaply transport cotton or cotton cloth. If we import gutta percha, we obtain it from one who desires to buy cloth, and to whom cloth can then be cheaply sent. If we import gutta percha goods, we obtain them from men who have cloth to sell, and to whom cotton cannot be cheaply sent. If we desire, then, to increase

our commerce and our navigation, the object is to be accomplished by the adoption of measures that will bring the loom to take its place by the side of the plough. The harmony of the agricultural, manufacturing, and shipping interests would here appear to be complete.

With such an importation of men, there would be an annual addition of 1,000,000 with whom we would have *perfect* freedom of trade, uninterfered with by custom-house officers, sailors, or ships. At the end of ten years, there would be thus made an addition of twelve or thirteen millions of persons, who would consume twice as much cotton as is now consumed by the whole people of Great Britain and Ireland. The harmony between the views of the free-traders and those of the protectionists would thus appear to be almost perfect. The more the subject is examined, the more obvious does it become that the *only* road to perfect freedom of trade lies through perfect protection.

## CHAPTER TENTH.

### HOW PROTECTION AFFECTS THE FARMER.

AMONG the large exporters of food are Ireland, Canada, Russia, and the United States.

The first exports both food and population. The bulk of her trade is altogether outward, and the food has to bear all the cost of the voyage out and home. The yield to the producer is therefore small, and tends rapidly to diminish, the consequences of which are, famine, pestilence, and depopulation.

The second exports food and lumber, and imports some population for home consumption, and much that is exported to the United States. The excess of exports is, however, sufficiently great to throw nearly the whole weight of the voyage out and home upon the producer.

Neither of these countries has any protection against the colonial system. The food they export comes back to them in the form of cloth and iron, duty free, and almost freight free, because the bulk of the traffic is in the outward direction.

Russia exports food, but she protects manufactures, and thus makes a market for much of it at home. Her capacity to supply grain is by one authority stated to be equal to 17,000,000, and by another 28,000,000 of quarters, (153 and 252 millions of bushels of 60 pounds weight,) and we are told that—

“In the years when there is no foreign demand for this surplus, a portion of it is employed, with little regard to economy, in fattening cattle for the butchers, and for the sake of the tallow. Much is absolutely wasted, and the remainder, left unthreshed, becomes the prey of birds and mice.” Also that “if a foreign market could be found for it, Russia could easily export annually 50,000,000 of quarters of grain, (equal to 450,000,000 of bushels of sixty pounds weight.)”\*

The system of that country is adverse to the growth of wealth and intelligence. Large armies and hosts of officials are maintained out of her heavy taxes, paid from the earnings of the producing classes, while the existence of serfdom, and the necessity for giving so large a portion of the lives of the healthiest and best-formed of the population to the business of carrying sabres and muskets, tends to prevent the existence of any hope of improvement; and without hope there can be little disposition for exertion. Nevertheless, as we see, the Russian has food to waste, while Irishmen perish by tens of thousands of starvation.

In this country the system of protection exists. It is now limited to thirty

\* London Economist.



per cent.; and for the last twenty years it has but once, and for a very brief period, been at a lower point. By its aid there has been produced a diversification of pursuits, that enables men to economize much time and many things that would otherwise be wasted, while women and children find employment at such wages as enable them to be large consumers of both food and clothing. Wages are high, and hence it is that there is so large an import of the most valuable of commodities—man.

We imported last year about 300,000 persons. Estimating their consumption of food at twenty cents per day for each, there was thus made a market on the land for the products of the land to the extent of *twenty millions of dollars*. Their transportation required the constant employment of 250,000 tons of shipping, and ships carried freight to Europe at very low rates, because certain of obtaining valuable return cargoes. The farmer thus obtained a large home market, and the power of exporting cheaply to the foreign one, and to the conjoined operation of these two causes is due the fact that wheat and flour have continued so high in price.

We may now, I think, understand many curious facts now passing before our eyes. Food is so abundant in Russia that it is wasted, and yet among the large exporters of food to Great Britain is this country, in which it sells at a price almost as high as in Liverpool, and now even higher. The produce of Russia has to bear all the charges out and home, and the consequence is, that the producer remains poor and makes no roads, and thus the cost of transportation, internal and external, continues, and must continue, great. The farmer of the United States sends his produce to market cheaply, because the return cargo, being chiefly man, is valuable, and the space it occupies is great. He therefore grows rich, and makes roads, and canals, and builds steamboats; and thus is the cost of transportation, internal and external, so far diminished that the difference in the price of a barrel of flour in Pittsburgh and in Liverpool is, when we look at the distance, almost inconceivably small.

The bulk of the trade of Canada is outwards; and the consequence is that outward freights are high, while our imports of men and other valuable commodities keep them low with us, and therefore it is that the cost of transporting wheat and flour from our side of the line is so much lower than from the other, that both now pass through New York on their way to Liverpool.\* Hence it is that there has arisen so vehement a desire for commercial re-

---

\* From one of the journals of the day I take the following extract from a Canadian letter:—

“Our commercial relations with your Union are a subject of great anxiety with us at the present time. Wheat is worth from 2s. to 3s., York, more on your side of the Lake than on this. This is owing to two causes: the 20 per cent. duty you impose upon our grain when imported and sold in your market, and the want of a sufficient number of resident wheat buyers who have sufficient capital to enable them to take advantage of your bonding Act. If your Cabinet has determined to annex us, they will refuse us reciprocity. In 1847, we exported of Canada wheat, 3,349,686 bushels, and in 1848, 3,413,397. We shall export, at least, twice as much this year; for every acre of land that was in a condition to grow wheat was sown with that grain, and the crop throughout the whole of Western Canada, except perhaps the Middle District, is unusually heavy.

“The Examiner estimates, and I think with tolerable accuracy, that our farmers will this year lose \$1,500,000, from a want of having free access for their produce to your markets. The Convention of Delegates from each of these Provinces, now sitting at Halifax, have under consideration the question of securing a more easy interchange of commodities between the Provinces and the States. A notion has got abroad, that if Canada, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland were united, they would then have a better chance of obtaining free trade from you than in their present isolated condition. It is rumoured that the Home Government, for some

ciprocity, and even for annexation. The protective system has thus not only the effect of bringing consumers to take their places by the side of the producer, facilitating the consumption on the land of the products of the land, and facilitating also the exportation of the surplus to foreign markets, by diminishing outward freights, but the further one of producing among our neighbours a strong desire for the establishment of the same perfect freedom of trade that now exists among the several States, by becoming themselves a part of the Union. Protection, therefore, tends to the increase of commerce and the establishment of free trade, while the British system tends everywhere to the destruction of commerce and to the production of a necessity for restriction.

We see, thus, that if we desire to secure the command of that which is falsely called "the great grain market of the world," it is to be effected by the adoption of such measures as will secure valuable return freights. The most costly and the most valuable of all are men. The least so are pig-iron and coal. The more of the latter we import, the larger will be our surplus of food, the higher will be the outward freight, internal and external, the greater will be the waste, and the poorer will be the farmer. The more of the former we import, the smaller will be our surplus of food, the lower will be the outward freights, and the more numerous will be the commodities that can go to Europe, to be given in exchange for luxuries that now we cannot purchase.

Were we now importing a million of men annually, the downward freights on our canals and railroads would be greatly diminished, while the outward freight across the ocean would be little more than would pay the cost attendant upon loading and unloading it, and yet we should be building ships and steamboats, and making railroads at a rate of which we could now form no conception.

By aid of these men, coal and iron would be produced by millions of tons, and the increased facility of obtaining food and iron would give new facilities for building cotton and woollen mills, and type-foundries and printing-offices, and all the men employed in them would be large consumers of food, and thus would the farmer gain on every hand.

The labourer, in Ireland, obtains 6*d.* or 8*d.* for a day's labour when employed, but the average of the year is even less than the former sum. He is our great customer for Indian corn, the cost of which, by the time it reaches him, is about 4*s.* or five times what it has yielded to the farmer, delivered on his farm. Eight day's labour are thus required for the purchase of a bushel. Transfer that man to the coal-fields of Ohio or Indiana, and he may purchase far more by the work of a single day. He at once becomes a much better customer for food, and is enabled to consume largely of sugar and coffee, to the advantage of the merchant—of wool, to the further advantage of the cultivator of the land—of lumber, to the advantage of the man who has land uncultivated that he desires to clear—of cotton, and indigo, to the benefit of the planter—and thus it is that every interest in the country profits by the transfer of the poor cultivators of Ireland, and of Germany, to the coal fields and iron-ore beds of the Union.

The young Englishman who aspires to be an operative spinner, and now fills

---

purpose of its own, has recommended this federation, and of course the Colonial puppets who move at the dictation of Downing street, will pretend that a measure which has been forced upon them, originated in the commercial necessities of the Provinces. To obtain the free trade they desire, the Nova-Scotians showed symptoms of a willingness to admit your fishing vessels a little nearer than within three miles of their shores; and Canada would probably throw open her coasting-trade to your vessels, if England will permit her, after the new Navigation Law comes into operation."

the place of the latter in his absence, receives 7s. 6d.—\$1.80 per week,\* the price of two bushels of Indian corn. Place him in Alabama, and he will earn the present price of twenty bushels, and he will then eat more and better food, and consume ten pounds of cotton where now he consumes but one.

The hand-loom weavers, of whom England has 800,000, without work for one-third of the number,† consume little food or cotton. Transfer them here, and they will become large consumers of both.

The agricultural labourer of England receives 8s. or 9s. a week, little over the price of a bushel and a half of wheat. Transfer him here, and his services as a miner, or labourer, will enable him to earn the price of five or six bushels. He will then consume more and better food, and largely of cotton.

The poor Highlander, driven from his native hills to make room for sheep, starves in the miserable lodging-houses of Glasgow.‡ Could he be transferred here, he would become a large consumer of food and clothing.

Our present policy is directly the reverse of all this. We are exporting men by tens of thousands to California, and by hundreds of thousands to the West, thus diminishing the power of combination of action, and increasing the necessity for the use of ships and wagons to carry their produce to market. Thus far the immigration has been maintained, and freights to Europe are consequently low, but, with the diminished wages of the labourer, immigration must fall off, and then freights must rise, and thus the same measures that diminish the home consumption must increase the cost of going to the distant market. The cost of the voyage out and home *must* be paid by somebody. If there is no return freight, the farmer or planter must pay the whole. If there is a large and valuable return freight, he need pay scarcely any portion of the cost. To California, we must pay all the outward freight, for there is no cargo to be returned. Bulky articles, the produce of the farm, cannot, therefore, go from here, and the consequence is, that every emigrant to that country is a customer lost to the farmer, and a customer to a diminished extent to the planter.

The most costly and most valuable of commodities, as I have already said, is Man. The more valuable the commodities that can be imported into any country, without going in debt for them, the richer that country will grow; and this is equally true of every State, county, township, town, &c., into which it may be divided. Of this no one can doubt, and yet every portion of the Union is engaged in exporting to the West, to Texas, Oregon, and California, this most valuable of all commodities, receiving

\* London Economist, Vol. VI. p. 259.

† Edinburgh Review, October, 1849.

‡ A recent British journal, speaking of the Queen's visit to Scotland, thus describes the effects of the desolating policy that has been pursued in the Highlands:—

*"The untilled hills and glens tell their own story most effectually. The sheep farms of twenty miles length and breadth proclaim the dark character of that policy which is fast making of the Highlands a great hunting-ground. Her Majesty is to pass through a land of Ameers. The same wretched policy as that which has desolated Scinde, originating in the same miserable cause—the selfishness and pleasure-seeking of the owners—has laid waste the Highlands. They want a Sir Charles Napier—a legislative if not a military Napier. They need the repeal of the game and entail laws, and with those laws repealed, in twenty years there would be no difficulty in finding a population to welcome the monarch on the beautiful but now desolate shores of Loch Long and Loch Awe. The pines§ would flourish again; and newspaper reporters would not be weighing the question whether there be or be not a habitable house where they might rest within ten miles of Loch Laggan."*—*North British Mail.*

§ The standard of the Campbells, who inhabited this region, bore a pine.



nothing in return. We import now hundreds of thousands, yet the old States retain scarcely any of them. All must go West, for the working of mills and furnaces is stopped, and the building of mills is at an end until we have a change of policy. Such is the effect of the colonial system, established for the purpose of preventing combination of action among the people composing various nations of the world, and maintained by the pursuit of measures destructive alike to the interests of the people of England, and of the world at large. "Many of our manufacturers," says a Manchester broker, "have exported to a loss, and if, by so doing, they have kept foreign competition at bay, and checked the increase of industrial establishments abroad, it is an unenviable success; still," he adds, "as this country is doomed to be a manufacturing state, nothing remains but to beat or be beaten."\*

These losses are of perpetual recurrence. They are a natural consequence of the "war upon the labour and capital of the world," in which England must "beat or be beaten." They must be paid by somebody, and they are paid by the labourers of England, who are compelled to work at diminished wages; but to a much greater extent by the labourers of the world, who are compelled to be idle, earning nothing to pay the farmers and planters for food and clothing, when they would gladly be employed, earning wherewith to feed and clothe themselves and their children.

How small is, under these circumstances, the power to consume food, will be obvious to those who see that three-fourths of the people of England are consumers and not producers, and that yet their import of grain of the last two years of free trade is but two bushels per head. How insignificant is the quantity she takes from us, and trivial the amount when distributed among the people of the Union, may be seen from the following statement of the last two years of comparatively large export:—

	Flour. Barrels.	Wheat. Bushels.	Corn. Bushels.	Corn-meal. Barrels.
Year ending June 30, 1848,	958,744	1,531,000	5,062,000	226,000
" Aug. 31, 1849,	1,114,016	4,684,000	12,721,000	88,000

The last and largest amounts in round numbers, to 10,000,000 of bushels of wheat, and 13,000,000 of bushels of corn. Deducting the transportation, the product of this on the farm may be taken at not exceeding, and probably not equalling \$10,000,000, or less than fifty cents per head for the people of the Union. What is the prospect that even this amount will continue to be exported may be judged by the facts that nothing but the exceeding lowness of freights has thus far maintained the export, and that calculations, based upon the low price of food in Europe, are now being made upon the export of grain to this country.

"The accounts that have reached us from your side about the wheat crop have led to an idea here that it is not improbable the United States may become an importing country for grain, as on some previous occasion about ten or twelve years ago. We regard this as highly improbable ourselves, although Sturges allude to it in their commercial circular to-day. It is said *Mark Lane governs the world's grain prices*: and, if so, the European range may certainly be expected to be very low, for the fall here is fully 5s. to 6s. per quarter, one-sixth of the entire value, within the last month. Oats are down to 16s. per quarter."—*London Correspondent of the National Intelligencer*.

The shipments of both wheat and flour have already fallen off in a most extraordinary degree, since freights have somewhat advanced. In September, flour was carried to Liverpool for 6*d.* a barrel, and sometimes even less. The lapse of two months has brought the charge up to 18*d.*, and the

---

\* Circular of Du Fay & Co., March 1, 1848.

effect is shown in the following statement of the export from the principal ports of the Union from the first of September to the latter part of November:—

	Flour. Barrels.	Meal. Barrels.	Wheat. Bushels.	Corn. Bushels.
1849 . . . .	118,000	1,210	212,504	544,874
Last year, same period	491,000	27,754	849,350	3,447,820
Decrease . . . .	373,000	26,544	636,846	2,902,946

Notwithstanding the large increase of agricultural population, the quantity of wheat and flour received at tide-water, on the Hudson, shows a diminution, while the only increase is that of about 2,000,000 of bushels of corn, which found a market abroad only because of the very low freights.

The import of men has made a market for \$20,000,000 worth of food, and these people, once here, remain consumers of food, and customers to the farmer, unless compelled to become producers of food and rivals to the farmer.

The "great grain market of the world" has absorbed half as much because of the low freights, but with the advance of freight it is now diminishing, and must still further diminish with the continuance of that advance. "Since the commencement of the California excitement, near seven hundred vessels," we are told,\* "have left for the Pacific, many of which will never re-visit us." These ships will not be replaced unless freights be sufficiently high to pay their owners. If immigration go on, they will be soon replaced, and the cost of doing it will be paid by immigrants who come to be customers to the farmer and planter. If it do not, they will not be replaced, and the high freights of the remaining ones must be paid by the farmers and planters seeking customers in Europe.

That immigration will be arrested, must be obvious to all who study the tables given in the third chapter. The difficulty of obtaining food, fuel, and clothing—*i. e.* wages—in return for labour, is increasing. The value of man is falling, and the inducements to immigration are passing away. Should it diminish next year to the extent of 100,000 persons, there will be a loss of market to the extent of \$7,000,000. The California excitement which carried off so very many thousands of the customers of the farmer, with food to feed them on the road,† will no longer exist. Here is another hundred thousand customers lost to the farmer, and with them a demand for another \$7,000,000 worth of food. The European market is being closed. Nothing that diminishes production can maintain prices.

A comparison of the amount of immigration and the prices of wheat during the last few years, will show how essentially the interests of the farmer are connected with every operation tending to bring the consumer to take his place by the side of the producer:—

Years.	Immigration.	Price of Wheat in Philad.	Price of Flour in N. Y.
1840 .	84,000 .	\$1·00 .	\$5·25 .
1841 .	83,000 .	94 .	5·72 .
1842 .	101,000 .	1·12 .	5·74 .
1843 .	75,000 .	75 .	4·47 .
1844 .	74,000 .	89 .	4·70 .

\* New York Herald.

† "Your receipts of beef from Missouri will be very moderate this winter, in consequence of the great demand for cattle to carry emigrants to California."—*Correspondent of the Tribune.*

Years.	Immigration.	Price of Wheat in Philad.	Price of Flour in N. Y.
1845	102,000	86*	4.52*
1846	147,000	1.04	5.23
1847	234,000	1.33	5.96 [potato rot.]
1848	229,000	1.19	about 5.25
1849	299,000		5.00

If we convert into iron delivered back upon the farm, free of duty, all the food that has been this year exported, we shall find that it will yield 250,000 tons, or twenty-five pounds for every person of the population. Let us now go to the vicinity of a furnace, and see how light, by comparison, is the charge for iron when it is produced on the spot, and paid for in commodities of which the earth yields by tons, as potatoes or hay—or in straw that would otherwise be wasted—or in labour not required on the farm, and then estimate how many tons might have been obtained by the producers of this grain, had they made a market on the land for the products of the land.

Let us now suppose that instead of closing old furnaces we had built fifty new ones, each capable of making 5000 tons, with rolling-mills to convert the product into bars, and had thus applied the labour of some of those immigrants; and that we were now making, as we might readily be doing, 250,000 tons of iron more than was made last year, would not that alone have made a *permanent* market on the land for as much of the products of the farmer as we have exported to England? Would not that have reduced the cost of iron? Would it not have raised the price of labour? Would it not have promoted immigration? Would it not have promoted the building of ships and the reduction of freights? Would not the farmer thus have had the control of the market of England to a much greater extent than he can have under a system that discourages immigration and ship-building? Does not his *power* to go abroad increase with the diminution of the *necessity* for seeking a market abroad? If we were importing largely of raw silk and men from Italy, could we not send cotton yarn to Italy more cheaply than it now goes through England?—and if we were importing silk weavers from France, could we not send to France, in return, God, in the form of coal and iron, at less cost for freight than that at which they now have English coal and iron that must pay all the cost of the voyage out and home? The greater the value of the import trade—and men are the most valuable commodities we can import—the greater will be the variety of articles we can export.

It is contended that by having two markets to which he *must* resort, the condition of the farmer is improved, and that if he had but the home-market he would have lower prices than at present—that is to say, that if he could sell all he produces at home, he would obtain less than he now obtains by going from home. Directly the reverse is the fact, when men are *compelled* to seek a distant market.

The first questions to be asked in reference to this are—Why is he obliged to go from home? Why does the supply of food increase faster than the demand? For this there are two reasons. First: we do not import consumers enough; and, Second: of those whom we do import, too many are forced to become producers of food, in consequence of the difficulty attendant upon employing themselves in other pursuits where they would be consumers of food. The man who works in a coal mine earns \$300 a year, and perhaps more. Much of this goes for food,

\* Some of these variations are, of course, attributable to the extent of the crop. The yield of wheat in the West in this year was larger than in any since 1839.

† Offers have been made to transport coal to France at little more than the ordinary freight from Philadelphia to Boston.



and all of it goes in payment for things that are the product of the earth, for every man is a consumer to the full extent of his production. Ten thousand miners and labourers are customers for those products to the extent of \$3,000,000. Forty thousand mechanics, miners, and labourers, are customers to the farmer and planter to the extent of \$12,000,000, which is far more than we can expect to export in future years. We now import annually above a quarter of a million of people, and there are half a million of our own home-grown population annually attaining maturity. By deducting from agriculture 20,000 working-men we diminish the number of producers, and by employing these 20,000 in other pursuits we increase the number of consumers to such an extent as to prevent the existence of the surplus of which we now complain. Judging, however, from the past, the adoption of protection as a permanent system would result in the increase of immigration to a vast amount, and of these a large proportion would gladly remain consumers of food, whereas under the present system they are compelled to become producers of food.

When farmers have a demand at home for all they raise, they obtain a higher price than when they have to go abroad. In the one case, they obtain nearly as much *more* than the price in distant markets as the cost of transportation *from* those markets, whereas, when they have to go abroad, they obtain as much *less* than the price in those markets as the cost of transportation *to* those markets, *and the price of the whole is regulated by that which can be obtained for the trivial surplus.* Grain and flour have for several years been higher in the coal region of Pennsylvania than in Philadelphia, because the demand has been always in excess of the supply. Close the mines, and the farmers will have to send their products to Philadelphia, receiving therefor the city prices, *minus* the cost of transportation. At the present time, the price of grain throughout the Union is maintained wholly by the domestic market, for flour sells in Liverpool at less than the price in New York. Close the mines and factories, and convert miners and mechanics into farmers, and the price at home must be the Liverpool one, which will then be *lower* than at present, *minus* the cost of transportation, which will then be *higher* than at present.

Admitting, however, that we are to have at all future times, a surplus of grain for export, the next question would be—What is the course that will secure to the farmer the highest price in foreign markets? The answer must assuredly be, that it will be that which tends most to diminish the quantity to be sent to those markets from this or other countries. If, then, the present system of the commerce of the world tends to increase the supply, it must be adverse to the interests of the farmer. That such is the case can, I think, readily be shown.

We know that the more miners and mechanics we have, the more food we consume; and that the more agriculturists we have, the more food we produce. Such, then, must be the case with other countries. We know that under the protective system miners and mechanics increase in number, and that under the free-trade system the producers of food increase in number. Such, then, must be the case with other countries. It is obviously, then, to our interest that Russia and Germany should consume more food and export less, and that if they and we should do so, the price of food would rise. Russia and Germany, and we ourselves have established the protective system, and the result has been to increase the consumers and diminish the producers; and if all the world could follow our example, the supply of food now pouring into "the great grain market of the world" would be so far diminished that the price would rise. This, however, is

but one of the effects that would result from a general determination to put down the colonial system.

We have seen that the consumption of cotton in other countries is small, while here it is large. The price has already fallen so low that the planters are resorting to the cultivation of wheat, a measure that must tend to the injury of the farmer. Now, if we were consuming one half more cotton than at present, this state of things could not exist. The price obtainable by the planter would then be sufficiently high to prevent the necessity of abandoning its culture. Let us now suppose that Canada, and Russia, and Germany, and Ireland, could make a market for their now surplus labour, and thereby enable themselves to consume two or three pounds of cotton, where now they consume but one, and to consume more food than now they do—is it not obvious that the prices of food and cotton would both rise? That such would be the result of the abolition of the colonial system, as regards these countries, appears perfectly certain. If so, then the maintenance and extension of the protective system, with special reference to the entire abolition of that unnatural one which Great Britain has established, appears to me to be, most certainly, to the interest of the farmers as well as of the planters of the Union, and of the world.

Let us next examine the working of the system in Canada, in which there being, almost literally, no manufactures of any kind, there is no market on the land for the products of the land.

Freedom of trade is, there, perfect: that is to say, the people of Great Britain enjoy a *complete monopoly* of the machinery by aid of which alone the lumber and food of the people of Canada can be converted into cloth and iron. The consequence is, that the labour-cost of manufactured articles is so great that the consumption of them is small. The whole export of cotton cloth from Great Britain to her North American possessions, in the seven years, 1840–46, averaged twenty millions of yards, fine and coarse, and if the whole were there consumed, it would give but ten yards per head, or about two and a half pounds of cotton to each individual; whereas the consumption of the Union averages thirteen pounds per head, and is far more than that in the States nearest to Canada. If, now, we desire to know why it is that consumption is less on the one side of the line than on the other, the reason may be found in the fact, that the Canadian gives much more labour for his cloth and his iron than the American. Even his wheat is less in price; and if so, how must it be with those bulky commodities that will not bear transportation? He must, in the words of Sir Francis Head, “eat all he raises,” for he has not made, nor can he make a market on the land for the products of the land.

To the Canadians it is perfectly obvious that the price of food with us is maintained by the demand for home consumption, and therefore it is that there exists so universal a desire for the abolition of all restriction in the importation of their productions into the Union. They have perfect freedom of trade with “the great grain market of the world,” and by it they are ruined. They desire intercourse with the great grain-producers of the world, and to obtain it they would gladly sacrifice their intercourse with England, taking production in lieu of free trade, and becoming members of the Union.

Were Canada within the Union, her consumption of cotton would rise to a level with our own, for she would at once commence to make iron and cloth at home, producing thereby a demand for labour that is now being wasted. Instead of being a customer to the planter to the extent of two and a half pounds per head, every Canadian would take a dozen pounds; and thus would fifteen millions of pounds be added to the consumption, to the infinite advantage of the planter. The farmer of Illinois might then safely admit of free trade with

his Canadian neighbours, because with increased home consumption they would experience less necessity for going abroad to find that market for their products which the colonial system now denies to them at home. The farmer who believes in the advantage of free trade with England, should give his vote for the free admission of Canadian wheat, raised by men who consume cloth and iron made by men who eat the wheat of Poland and Russia. The farmer who sees that the price of wheat is maintained by the home demand, will be cautious of the admission of foreign wheat, duty free, until, by means of annexation, the farmer of Canada shall obtain the same protection that he himself enjoys, and thereby be enabled to make a market on the land for the products of the land.

Having thus examined the effects of protection, let us now look to what would be the effects of the adoption of perfect freedom of trade, as urged upon the world by England. It could not fail to be that of *rivetting upon the world the existing monopoly of machinery for the conversion of the products of the farm and the plantation into cloth and iron*, closing the factories and furnaces of Russia, Germany, and the United States, and compelling the people who work in them to seek other modes of employment, and the only resource would be to endeavour to raise food. There would then be more food to sell; but who would buy it? We have already seen that the whole exports of Great Britain amount, after paying for the grain she now imports, to but \$4 32 per head, and that, small as it is, it tends to diminish. With that she has to pay for her sugar, tea, coffee, cotton, wool, lumber, and all other foreign articles required for her own consumption, leaving her no power to pay for more grain. Nevertheless it would be poured into her markets, and the consequence would be that she would obtain three bushels where now she has but one, precisely as we have seen to be the case with cotton. "Mark Lane governs the world's grain prices," and as the price obtainable for the surplus would fix that of the crop, the result would be, that the farmers would everywhere be ruined, and this with no benefit to the manufacturers of England, for her farmers would likewise be ruined, and her agricultural labourers would be discharged, as is now the case with Ireland, whose population, deprived of employment at home, swarms to England, and destroys the power of the English labourer to obtain food, even at its present low prices—and the lower they fall, the less must be the demand for labour, and the less the power to obtain wages.

The proverb says, "put not too many eggs in one basket." The object of the British system is, and has always been, that of compelling the world to put all the eggs in the same basket; and the natural result is the occurrence of perpetual convulsions, producing devastation and ruin throughout the world, whenever her artificial system becomes deranged. A review of her operations, during the past thirty years, shows her, at every interval of four or six years, holding out to the world the strongest inducements to send her all they could spare of sugar, and coffee, and cotton, and agricultural produce of every description. About the close of the second year of this movement, when the machinery of importation had got into full operation, a change is seen to have "come over the face of the dream," and the whole energies of the country to have been directed to breaking down prices, with a view to compel exportation. The farmers and planters whom she so recently courted are now ruined. Their agents are selected as the first victims, and if the result be bankruptcy, public or private, it is followed by vituperation of the foulest kind; and thus is insult added to injury. The people of Pennsylvania and Maryland, Indiana and Illinois, Michigan and Mississippi, have had to endure all this, the result of the working of the Compromise tariff of 1833. In 1846, the whole world was urged to send food at any price.



In 1847, the whole object was to depress prices. Rice was sold for the mere freight and charges. Large shipments of corn brought the shippers in debt for the payment of those expenses. The fever and the chill having passed away, there is next seen to succeed a period of languor: then one of moderate activity, such as is now beginning to make its appearance. Next, speculation, excitement, and large imports, to be followed by the ruin of all around, in the effort to save herself. At the present moment, she takes certificates of debt in payment for iron, as was the case ten years since; but the day is not far distant when these certificates will have to be redeemed with gold.

Were it proposed to the people of the Union to make New York or Pennsylvania the deposit for all the products of the Union that required to be converted or exchanged, the absurdity of the idea would be obvious to every one. The wheat-grower of Michigan would find himself entirely at a loss to know why he should exchange with the neighbouring wool-grower by way of New York; and the cotton-grower of South Carolina would be equally at a loss to see the benefit of a system that should compel him to exchange with the wheat-grower of Virginia, through the medium of Philadelphia or Pittsburgh; yet such is precisely the object of the colonial system. The wheat of Michigan travels to Liverpool with the wool of Michigan, and the exchanges between the wheat-grower and the wool-grower are effected through the market of Leeds, three-fourths of the wool and the wheat being lost on the road. The rice of South Carolina goes to Manchester in company with the cotton of South Carolina; and the corn and the cotton of Tennessee cross the ocean together; and this long journey is performed under the idea that the planter can obtain more cloth for his rice, or the farmer more iron for his corn, by this circuitous mode of exchange than he would do if the exchanges were made on the spot. There are many who doubt the truth of this, yet all English politico-economical writers assure us that such is the fact; and every measure now adopted by the British Government is directed towards the maintenance of the *monopoly of machinery*, by aid of which the people of the world have been compelled to make their exchanges in her factories.

If such a course would, under any circumstances, be absurd, how much more absurd is it in a case like the one under consideration, where the power of purchase is so small, and so little capable of increase. Whatever goes to England must be there consumed, unless it can be forced off by means of low prices; and for what she consumes, be it much or little, she has \$4.32 per head of her population to distribute, in the form of cloth and iron, among the farmers and planters of the world. It is a Procrustean bed, and the misfortune of the poor farmers and planters is, that whatever she cuts off from the portion sent to her is, as a consequence of the system, cut off from all the crop.

The producers of the world have been, and they are now being, sacrificed to the exchangers of the world; and therefore it is that agriculture makes so little progress, and that the cultivators of the earth, producers of all we consume, are so universally poor, and so generally uninstructed as to their true interests. The day, however, cannot be far distant when our farmers and planters, at least, will be satisfied that their interests cannot be promoted by a system that separates the consumers from the producers, and renders cloth and iron so costly as to cause the average amount of the consumption of either to be utterly insignificant.

The object of protection is that of diminishing the distance and the waste between the producer and the consumer; thereby enabling the producer to grow rich, and to become a large consumer of cloth and iron. That it did produce that effect is obvious from the immense increase in the consumption of both in the period between 1843 and 1847. That the facility of obtaining

iron enabled the farmer to improve his mode of production and obtain large returns is obvious from the fact that the supply of food increased so rapidly. That the free-trade system produces the reverse effect, is obvious from the great reduction in the consumption of iron in the years 1842 and 1843, and from the reduction now going on; the whole consumption of this year not equalling that of 1847, notwithstanding the vast increase of population.

The producers of food throughout the world have one common interest, and that is to be promoted by the abolition of the existing *monopoly system*, which tends to destroy themselves and their customers.

The farmer is also a *producer of wool*, and therefore I will briefly allude to that interest.

If we desire evidence of the truth of what has been said in relation to food, it may be found in the condition of the wool market for several years past. Our production is less than our ordinary consumption, and the consequence is, that the price is *higher* than in any country of the world, by the whole amount of the cost of transportation.\* Close the woollen mills, and the price must fall to the level of the markets of Europe, *minus* the cost of exportation. The increased supply then would, as a matter of course, produce a fall of prices, and then the sheep grower would be ruined.

The changes of policy of the last twenty years have several times ruined the woollen manufacturers, and the sheep growers have as often exterminated their flocks; the consequence of which is, that we have less than 30,000,000, when, if the policy adopted in 1828 had been maintained, we should now have 100,000,000, and a market for their whole products at higher prices than now; for the prosperous labourers, miners and mechanics, cotton-growers and food-growers, would then consume six pounds where now they consume but three, and the number of our population would be greater by 7,000,000 than at present. The discord that now exists is the result of the "war upon the labour and capital of the world" maintained by England, and when peace shall have been restored by the abolition of the monopoly, it will be found that, between the interests of the sheep-grower, the producer of food, the miner and the mechanic, there is perfect harmony.

## CHAPTER ELEVENTH.

### HOW PROTECTION AFFECTS THE PLANTER.

HAVING thus shown how the English, or colonial, system operates upon the farmers of England and of the world at large, I propose now to examine how it operates upon the planters.

Of all the products of the earth, cotton is that which is best fitted for clothing purposes, and that which would be most universally used were it accessible to those who desired to use it, which it is not. There are few commodities that can be more easily raised, none that can be converted into clothing at less cost of labour, and yet, so defective are the arrangements for its distribution, that by the time it reaches the consumer it has become so costly that its consumption is almost nothing.

The whole quantity of cotton raised is probably 1,500,000,000 pounds, being about one and a half pounds for each person composing the population of the world; yet, notwithstanding the exceeding smallness of this quantity, the power of consumption throughout the world is so small that the

producers are contending with each other for the possession of the markets : and the competition is so great that whenever the crop of this country reaches 1000,000,000 pounds, it is sold at a price less than the actual cost of production. Some of the countries that formerly exported it to a considerable extent, now raise little more than is needed for their own small consumption ; and even here the question of limiting the quantity, as the only way to avoid ruin, has been the subject of anxious discussion. Throughout the South, planters are turning their attention to food, although the market for every description of food is, and must continue to be, glutted, unless we have a change of policy.

There is a perpetual complaint of over-production, and it is matter of rejoicing when, by reason of short seasons, or any other occurrence, the crop is diminished 200,000 or 300,000 bales, the balance producing more in the market of the world than could otherwise have been obtained for the whole. No better evidence need be desired that there exists some error in the distribution.

Over-production cannot exist, but under-consumption may and does exist. The more that is produced, the more there is to be consumed ; and as every man is a consumer in the exact ratio of his production, the more he can produce the better it will be for himself and his neighbour, unless there exist some disturbing cause, preventing the various persons desiring to consume from producing what is needed to enable them to effect their exchanges with the planter, to the extent that is necessary to their comfort.

In examining into the movements of the cotton trade of the world, I may sometimes have occasion to refer to facts already given ; and if I prefer to re-state them, it is because, from the great importance of a proper understanding of the subject, I deem it best to collect all the facts necessary to that end under one head.

The two great cotton-producers of the world are India and the United States. The former has long exported to distant markets food and cotton, indigo and saltpetre, bulky articles, the freight and charges upon which absorb nearly the whole product, and, as a necessary consequence, the condition of the people has steadily deteriorated. The difficulty of obtaining food has steadily increased as her manufactures have declined, and repeated famines and pestilences have swept off millions, thus diminishing the power of combination ; and she now *therefore* exports men to occupy the places recently occupied by the slaves of Jamaica, Guiana, Demarara, and other of the West India colonies. With each such step, the cotton culture recedes from the low and rich lands towards the higher and poorer ones, and the condition of the cultivator deteriorates, for with each a larger proportion of his product is swallowed up in the cost of transportation.

In the early part of the present century, the manufacturers of India supplied cotton goods to a large portion of the world. England had then, however, invented machinery for its production, and to secure herself in its exclusive use she had prohibited its export, as well as that of artisans, and thus she compelled the cotton to come to the loom, instead of permitting the loom to go to the cotton. By degrees she cut off the foreign market of the manufacturer, but his home market still remained to him, so long as the Company retained the exclusive control of the trade. In 1821, the last year of the monopoly, the export from England to India was but 5,000,000 of yards, and 4,000,000 of pounds of yarn. In 1832, it had reached 60,000,000. In the first half of last year it was 110,000,000 of yards, and 10,000,000 of pounds of yarn. Large as are these figures, they require but little more than 100,000 bales for their production, and would make a consumption of perhaps 220,000 bales per annum, to take the place of that which has



ceased to be raised. With every step in the increase of importation, production has diminished. The culture and the manufacture both have disappeared from the rich lands of Bengal. The fields formerly occupied by this most useful plant have relapsed into jungle, and if we now desire to find the poor cotton planter we must seek him among the hills, where he obtains small crops in return for much labour, and then spends months in the work of transportation to the Ganges, where his miserable product is shipped to Calcutta on its way to England, to return to him at the close perhaps of the second year, giving him a few yards of poor cloth, a combination of cotton and flour, in return for the cultivation of an acre of land.\*

Under this system the value of labour diminishes steadily and regularly, and with it the quantity and quality of the cotton produced,† yet Englishmen are accustomed to regard the low price of labour as one of the elements of cheap production, and to look to it as affording good reason to hope for large supplies in future. Thus Mr. Porter informs us that :—

“In the level plains of Candeish, and in many other parts of Hindostan, cotton wool, freed from the seed, could be sold with a profit to the cultivators, at one penny per pound, a cost which is trebled or quadrupled by the expense of conveyance to the ports of shipment.”—*Porter's Progress of the Nation*.

The price which remains to the cultivator is one penny per pound, but where “the profit” is to be found when the whole wages consist in an insufficient supply of the poorest food and clothing, followed by famine and pestilence in every case of failure of crops, it is difficult to imagine. Such, however, is the usual mode of treating this subject in England.‡ The more

\* The produce of the great cotton-growing districts on the Nerbudda is carried on oxen, each taking one hundred and sixty pounds, at the extreme rate, in fair weather, of seven miles a day. The distance to Mirzapore, on the Ganges, is five hundred miles, and the cost is two and a half pence, or five cents, per pound. Thence it goes to Calcutta, a distance of eight hundred miles, by water, unaided, I believe, by steam. From another portion of the cotton-growing districts, in the Deccan, the transport occupies a continuous journey of two months, and in the rainy season the road is impassable and the traffic of the country is at a stand. *In the absence of even a defined road*, the carriers, with their pack cattle, are compelled to travel by daylight to prevent the loss of their bullocks in the jungles through which they have to pass, and this under a burning sun of from one hundred to one hundred and forty degrees. If the horde, sometimes amounting to a thousand, is overtaken by rain, the cotton, saturated with moisture, becomes heavy, and the black clayey soil, *through which lies the whole line of road*, sinks under the feet of a man above the ankle, and under that of a laden ox to the knees: and in this predicament the cargo lies sometimes for weeks on the ground, and the merchant is ruined! “Black clayey soils,” rich and fertile, are here superabundant, but the poor wretch who raises the cotton must cultivate the high lands that require neither clearing nor drainage, and his masters take half the product of their poor soils while refusing even to make a road *through* the rich ones: yet forcing him to send his cotton to market to be exchanged for cotton cloth manufactured thousands of miles distant. A system better calculated to compel men to continue cultivating the poorest soils, by aid of sticks, could not be devised.

† Import of cotton from India into England :—

1844	. . . . .	88,000,000 lbs.
1845	. . . . .	58,000,000 “
1846	. . . . .	34,000,000 “

Total export of all India to all parts of the world :—

1835-36	. . . . .	1,305,000 cwts.
1836-37	. . . . .	1,557,000 “
1844-45	. . . . .	1,623,000 “
1845-46	. . . . .	1,328,000 “
1846, 8 months	. . . . .	600,000 “

‡ A series of popular lectures on the cotton manufacture has recently been delivered in London, by Mr. Warren, of Manchester. In his first lecture he stated that should the

unproductive labour can be made the lower will be its price, the more confident will be the hope of using it to advantage, and the larger will be the sums expended in an effort that must prove for ever vain, while the people shall continue to be prevented from consuming on the land the products of the land.\*

The deterioration of quality is due to the recession of cultivation from the lower and richer lands; and that recession is a consequence of the system that has ruined the manufacturers of India, and destroyed the power of combination of action. We know the superiority of the sea-island cotton. In Demarara, cotton plantations have always succeeded better on the sea-coast than in the interior. So was it in India. Salt manure is deemed to be of absolute necessity if superior quality be desired, as it gives a staple at once strong and silky. Such being the case, it is useless to attempt improvement, when day by day the cultivation recedes from the neighbourhood of the *sea*, producing in England a strong desire for the making of railroads by which it may be enabled to make its way from the hills without costing more labour for its transportation than had been required for its production. Every such effort must prove a failure. Free trade with England drove it to the hills. Freer trade will drive it to hills yet more distant. In some cases it is thought that if the poor people could be provided with carts, they could extend the culture with advantage, but the use of such vehicles supposes the previous possession of something like laid-out roads, and those are luxuries with which most of India is yet unprovided.

Like the people of India, those of the Southern States of the Union have, thus far, had a bulky outward trade, that had, of course, to bear all the expenses of the voyage out and home. For a time, this prospered. India was distant from the machinery of conversion and Carolina was near, and while it still continued necessary to resort to the former for supplies, the price of that raised in the latter was the price in India, *plus* the difference of transportation. England was a sort of home market in which the planter obtained twenty or thirty cents per pound. By degrees, however, the near supply rose above the near demand, and it became necessary to seek for

manufacturing population of that country increase during the next ten years in the ratio in which it has done during the last, it will become necessary, in order to employ them, to secure a permanent and cheap supply of cotton. This can be done, he thinks, by cultivating *it* in British India, where, on the authority of Major-general Briggs, Sir Charles Forbes, and others, there can be produced a supply sufficient for the wants of the entire world, equal in quality to the article supplied from New Orleans, *and cheaper than it by one-half*. He states the wages of American slave labour to be equal to about 1s. 6d. per day, while *that of the free Hindoo is only about two pence*. The advantages to be derived from such a course, he stated to be the certainty of a good and adequate supply at a cheap rate, the consolidation of our Indian possessions by the means of commerce, and the emancipation of the American slaves, by rendering their labour profitless to the owners.

\* The "London Chronicle," of a late date, has an article showing that the efforts which have been put forth during the last few years to make India a cotton-growing country that might rival the United States have entirely failed. It notices the failure and abandonment of the experiments in cotton cultivation that have been carried on, under Dr. Wight's superintendence, at Madras. This enterprise, which had for its object the production of an article less palpably inferior to the cotton of America than the present badly-picked and indifferent Indian commodity, was zealously, and even lavishly, supported by the local government; but the late failure of a similar experiment in Bengal, after an outlay of about £100,000, had already given fair warning of the probable issue of Dr. Wight's efforts in the sister presidency, and with its abandonment would seem to settle the question that India will not again become, as it once was, a great cotton-growing country. In 1796 America did not export a single pound. In 1834 she exported as much as all the rest of the world put together. And in 1846, out of 467,856,274 lbs. imported into this country, 401,949,893 lbs. came from the United States, while only 34,556,143 were supplied by the East Indies and Ceylon! The total value supplied from India in 1845 did not exceed £600,000.

markets for cloth and yarn in India and China, in which the price realized by the producer could not exceed that at which it could there be sold, *minus* the difference of transportation. The necessary effect of this was to diminish the productiveness of Indian labour, and the power to consume cotton, and of course to increase the quantity to be forced upon the world, and with every step in course of this operation, there has been increased competition on the part of the American grower; the result of which is, that the Indian producer is ruined, and the American one is saved from ruin only by destructive operations of nature, frosts, freshets, and crevasses, by aid of which the supply is retained within the limits of demand.

The average consumption of this country is not less than thirteen, and is, most probably, fifteen pounds per head; and it is less, by at least one-half, than it would be but for the heavy cost, in labour, to the consumer. The average consumption of the world, outside of the Union, is little more than one pound per head, or about one-thirtieth of what it ought to be; and yet cotton has become almost the weed of the world, and men are everywhere desiring to substitute in its place something that could be better grown elsewhere. On the high lands they substitute wheat, which would grow better farther north. On the low lands they raise sugar, which would be much more productive farther south. Here are serious discords, and it is important that we trace the cause of their existence, with a view to provide a remedy for a state of things so unnatural.

With a view that we may do so, I give the following

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF CROPS, CONSUMPTION, &c., OF AMERICAN COTTON, FOR TWELVE YEARS.\*

	Crops, as shown by receipts the 31st Aug.	Consumed in the U. States, year end'g 31st Aug.	Stock at the ports end of the year 31st Aug.	Imports of American Cotton into Great Britain, from 1st Jan. to 31st Dec.	Total am't. of American Cotton consumed in Great Britain.	Stock of Am. Cotton in Gt. Britain, Dec. 31.	Average quot. of Uplands in Liverpool.
1836—7	1,422,930	222,540	109,036	1837 844,812	778,492	158,100	7 d.
1837—8	1,801,497	246,063	68,961	1838 1,124,800	913,328	316,100	7
1838—9	1,360,532	276,018	69,963	1839 814,500	813,488	242,300	7 $\frac{1}{8}$
1839—40	2,177,835	295,193	78,780	1840 1,237,500	1,018,784	403,000	6
1840—1	1,631,945	297,288	72,479	1841 902,500	809,900	344,600	6 $\frac{1}{2}$
1841—2	1,684,211	267,850	31,807	1842 1,013,400	893,256	373,400	5 $\frac{1}{2}$
1842—3	2,379,460	325,129	94,486	1843 1,396,800	1,110,046	593,200	4 $\frac{1}{2}$
1843—4	2,030,409	348,744	159,772	1844 1,246,900	1,126,008	654,900	4 $\frac{1}{2}$
1844—5	2,415,448	389,006	98,420	1845 1,499,600	1,289,808	809,100	4 $\frac{1}{2}$
1845—6	2,100,537	422,597	107,122	1846 937,000	1,280,096	397,800	4 $\frac{1}{2}$
1846—7	1,778,651	427,967	214,837	1847 874,100	867,516	286,200	6 $\frac{1}{2}$
1847—8	2,347,634	531,772	171,468	1848 1,375,400	1,189,500	348,300	4 $\frac{1}{2}$

The stock in our own ports, Aug. 31, 1836, appears to have been,	109,000
That of American cotton in English ports,	90,000†
The crops of the twelve years, from 1836—7 to 1847—8, were	23,571,000
To which must be added, for the additional consumption in the South and West, in the last two years,	125,000
Total,	23,805,000
The stock in port, and in G. B. at the close of the season 1847—8,	520,000
Consumption of twelve years,	23,375,000
Thus divided—English,	12,100,000
American,	4,052,000
Additional, as above,	125,000
	4,177,000
Leaving for the rest of the world,	7,098,000
	23,375,000

\* From the New York Courier and Inquirer.

† Duty,  $\frac{1}{16}$ d. per lb. taken off by Act of Parliament, passed 8th May, 1845.

‡ The imports of 1837 exceeded the consumption by 66,000 bales, and the stock, at the close of the year, was 158,000, from which, if we deduct the 66,000, there remain 92,000.



	Average of the first Two Years.	Total Average.	Average of last Two Years
English, . . .	846,000 .	1,008,000 .	1,028,000
American, . . .	235,000 .	348,000 .	542,000
All other, . . .	444,000 .	591,000 .	548,000*
	<hr/> 1,525,000	<hr/> 1,947,000	<hr/> 2,118,000

From this we see that the average consumption of the twelve years exceeded that of the first two, in the following ratio:—

English, . . . . .	18 per cent.
American, . . . . .	50 “ “
All other, . . . . .	22 “ “

But when we compare the first and last two years of the period, we obtain the following results:—

English, . . . . .	21 per cent.
American, . . . . .	125 “ “
All other, . . . . .	23 “ “

The portion of Europe that has most fully adopted the system of protection being the *Zoll-verein*,† it will be useful to compare the growth in their consumption with that of Great Britain and Ireland.

The imports of raw cotton into *Prussia* before the formation of the Tariff-league or *Zoll-verein*, remained from 1827 to 1835 stationary at 44,000 cwts. per annum.‡ That of yarn increased from 1823 to 1835, from 61,000 to 115,000 cwts. The total increase of twelve years, was from 105 to 159,000 cwts., or from 30 to 45,000 bales. The following shows the growth from that period in the territories of the confederation:—

	1836.	Average from 1837 to 1841.	1843.	1845.
Raw cotton, quintals . . .	152,364	200,093	306,731	443,887
Cotton twist and wadding, do. .	244,869	351,884	475,564	574,303
	<hr/> 397,233	<hr/> 551,977	<hr/> 782,295	<hr/> 1,018,190

The quantity has more than doubled, and the home consumption has increased about 75 per cent.§ in a period during most part of which our own consumption had remained stationary.|| The quantity of twist and wadding imported from Great Britain had increased 135 per cent. in a shorter period than was required in the latter for an increase in her home and foreign consumption of only 21 per cent. The power to import thus grew with the power of production. It is obvious that the consumption tends, and must tend, to increase most rapidly where there is the least intervention between the producer and the consumer, and equally so that the English demand, based upon the principle of intervention between the two, and consequent increase of cost to the consumer, cannot be largely and permanently increased. That of 1846–7 was less than that of 1837–8, and the difference between that of 1839–40 and that of 1847–8, great as was the fall of prices, was but 171,000 bales.

The great increase in the consumption of the *Zoll-verein* is due to pro-

\* This period embraces a season of war and convulsion over the whole continent.

† De Bow's Commercial Review, Vol. V. p. 267.

‡ Merchants' Magazine, Vol. XIII. p. 286.

§ Ibid.

|| The increase of consumption after the formation of the Union was very rapid. As early as 1838, it was said, that “The cotton manufacture of Saxony had already become of twice the extent it had reached before the Union.”—*Porter's Progress of the Nation*, Vol. II. p. 198. The quantity of cotton hosiery made in Saxony has increased immensely of late, and from its cheapness has not only secured the monopoly of the markets of the Union, but has also been shipped largely to the United States.

tection. If, now, from the additional British consumption we deduct the *additional* yarn sent to this one protected country, we shall be enabled to see how trivial is the power of increase in the *unprotected* world. The account will then stand thus:—

	First two years.	Last two years.	Ratio of increase.
English . . . . .	846,000 .	958,000* .	13 per cent.
Zoll-verein (1836) . .	100,000 .	230,000* .	130 “
American . . . . .	235,000 .	542,000 .	125 “
All other . . . . .	344,000 .	378,000 .	10 “

In the one case England took 846,000 at 7*d.*, total . . . \$53,000,000

In the other, 958,000 at 5½*d.* . . . . . 48,000,000

In both, the price was fixed in her own ports, and regulated by her own power of purchase. Had our home consumption absorbed 200,000 additional bales, thus reducing the supply to 750,000, the price would have been 8*d.* and the amount would have been . . . . . \$54,000,000  
and the product of the whole crop would have been almost doubled.

The consequence of this incapacity of extending her foreign market is, of course, the accumulation of large quantities in English ports, accompanied by a fall of prices, by aid of which the English consumer obtains a larger quantity for the labour that he can afford to give in exchange for the materials of clothing, and that tends to decrease as his labour becomes more unproductive, and as the disposition to “fly from ills they know” increases. This will be seen by the following table:—

Crop.	Bales.	Average price.	British and Irish consumption. Quantity.	Value.
1839—	1,368,000	14·5 cents.	73,000,000 pounds.	\$10,585,000
1840—	2,180,000	8·6 “	172,000,000 “	14,620,000
1841—	1,634,000	10·3 “	97,000,000 “	9,991,000
1842—	1,684,000	8·2 “	97,000,000 “	7,954,000
1843—	2,388,000	6 “	120,000,000 “	7,200,000
1844—	2,030,000	8·1 “	124,000,000 “	10,116,000
1845—	2,100,000	5·9 “	164,000,000 “	9,696,000
1846—	2,101,000	7·3 “	147,000,000 “	10,731,000
1847—	1,778,000	10·1 “	77,000,000 “	7,777,000
1848—	2,347,000	7 “	130,000,000 “	9,100,000
	1,961,000	8·6 “	1,201,000,000 “	9,777,000

The total home consumption by the 27,500,000 composing the population of the United Kingdom, was thus but 1,200,000,000 pounds, or an average of 120,000,000 per annum, giving 4½ pounds to each individual, supplied at a cost so low as to ruin the producer. The average of the first two years was 122,500,000, while that of the last two years was but 102,500,000, notwithstanding an increase of population that should have brought it up to 140,000,000.

From this statement it appears clearly that the power of the people of Great Britain and Ireland, to be customers to the cotton planters of the world, cannot go much beyond \$10,000,000; and that, instead of increasing with the population, it tends decidedly to diminish. The reason of this appears to me obvious. The people of England are perpetually engaged in the effort to sell the products of their labour in distant markets, in competition with low-priced labour, and therefore at the *lowest* price; receiving payment in food and other articles of consumption produced in distant markets, which come to them burdened with enormous cost of transportation, and therefore

\* I have deducted and added only 70,000 bales, supposing the last two years' export not to have been as great as that of 1845.

obtained at the cost of much labour. The natural growth of production elsewhere tends to increase the supply of raw materials, but the power to pay for them does not increase, because the labour of British subjects, home and colonial, instead of becoming more productive of commodities to be given in exchange, is becoming less so from month to month and from year to year, and yet into that constantly diminishing market are thrown all the surplus products of the world, that the price of the whole product may there be fixed. The effect of this is to throw on the planters the loss that should belong to themselves, and thus enable them to supply themselves at the *lowest* price; whereas, whenever the cotton planter shall cease to be dependent upon them for his market, they will again, as formerly, be obliged to buy at the *highest* price. The product of British labour, measured in the article of first necessity, food, is small, and the surplus remaining, to be applied to the purchase of clothing, is therefore very small indeed. They are incessantly engaged in supplying low-priced, and often worthless clothing to the world, and are therefore unable to clothe themselves.

That the tendency is downward, seems scarcely to admit of a doubt. A few years since, by a great effort, the poor-rates of England were reduced to less than £4,000,000. They have since risen gradually, and those of 1848 were £7,817,000, or \$38,000,000. Every ninth person is a pauper. In Scotland, the destitution of a large portion of the population is frightful. The people of the Northern and Western Highlands are in a state of pauperism; and Glasgow and its vicinity present a scene of wretchedness scarcely, if at all, to be exceeded in the world. Ireland is exhausted. There being no separate accounts of the imports into that kingdom, it is not possible to ascertain the present consumption of cotton, but the condition of the people is now far lower than at the dates of the following returns:—

The whole import of cotton into Ireland from all parts of the world, in the twenty years from 1802 to 1821 both inclusive, amounted to 538,542 hundred weights, or about 150,000 bales, being an average of 7500 bales per annum, and the whole import of cotton yarn, to 19,995,350 pounds, or about 1,000,000 pounds per annum, the product of about 4000 bales, making a total of 11,500 bales.\* The amount of cloth imported is not given.

In 1825, the year of great expansion everywhere, with an export to Great Britain of agricultural products amounting to almost \$35,000,000, we find the import of cotton-wool to have been 4,065,930 pounds, and the import of cotton cloth to have been 4,996,885 yards, making in the whole about 6,000,000 pounds, or about 18,000 bales of cotton, in all its forms, required for the supply of almost 8,000,000 people; being about three-quarters of a pound per head.

In subsequent years, no information can be obtained, owing to changes in the mode of keeping the custom-house accounts; but in a general report on the state of the trade of Ireland, made by a committee whose object would not have been promoted by under-estimates, it is stated that the import of cotton-cloth into that kingdom was, in 1835, 14,172,000 yards, being equal to about 4,000,000 pounds of cotton, or half a pound per head. What quantity of cotton-wool, or yarn, was imported at that time, cannot be ascertained, but it is elsewhere shown that some of the largest establishments for manufacture, of a period somewhat earlier, had disappeared, and that the calico printers were in a state of bankruptcy.†

We may now look to the consumption of the colonies of Great Britain. In the years 1845, '46, '47, the export to them was as follows,‡ in millions of pounds:—1845, 85; 1846, 87; 1847, 67. Of this, however, large

\* Ireland before and since the Union, by R. Montgomery Martin, pages 56 to 60. † Ibid

‡ Merchants' Magazine, Vol. XIX. 600.



quantities went to Gibraltar, Malta, Jamaica, and other places, to be smuggled into Spain, Mexico, and other countries, and the consumption of the colonies of themselves could not have exceeded 70,000,000, or about 170,000 bales, for more than 100,000,000 of inhabitants. During this time, the average price was a fraction over 7 cents, and it follows that \$5,000,000 is the maximum amount of trade maintained, through the medium of England, by the planting States of the Union, with a large portion of the people of the world, although producing two-thirds of the whole quantity of this necessary commodity for the use of the world.

Taking the total consumption of the United Kingdom and the colonies, we now have the following quantities :—

	1845.	1846.	1847.
Millions of pounds . . . . .	239	234	144

Need any better evidence be desired of the poverty inflicted by the system upon all the people subject to it, than the fact that an increase of price equal to one cent per yard reduces the consumption almost one-half?

Let this be compared with the growth of consumption in the protected markets of Germany and the United States, and it will be seen how steady is the protected, or real free-trade, system, compared with the perpetual change of the monopoly one. How great, too, the difference in the consumption per head!

While England and all her vast possessions consumed but	144,000,000
the consumption of the <i>Zoll-verein</i> (population 25,000,000)	
had grown in nine years from 45,000,000 to . . . . .	115,000,000
and that of the Union was . . . . .	243,000,000

We have seen how slow has been the growth of the English demand, and it may now be well to see the wasteful and exhausting process by which even this has been obtained. "The extremely low price of cotton," say Messrs. Rathbone, Brothers & Co.,\* "has encouraged the manufacture of a very inferior class of goods, which require a great weight of cotton compared to the labour expended on them, and *of which the make ceases entirely when cotton is moderately high*. The demand for very coarse yarn," they continue, "is always large at very cheap prices, but in the year just closed it has exceeded all precedent,† particularly for export, chiefly to the Levant, and in some instances to accelerate its make, *it has not passed through all the usual processes*. It is on the consumption of cotton for these classes of goods," they add, "that even a moderate advance in prices is apt so immediately to tell." The cotton thus forced into the Levant goes to the same countries that before were supplied from India, and thus is the poor Hindoo deprived of another portion of his market, the necessary consequence of which must be a further depression of prices, and increased inability to continue the work of production. The decline in the trade of Western India is remarkable, and is probably the result of this flooding of the Asiatic markets with half-made cotton goods.‡

\* Circular, January 3d, 1849.

† The prices of ordinary cotton ranging during a large portion of the year, from 3d. to 4d.

‡ The average imports of Bombay for the five years ending December 31, 1846, were 63,000,000 of rupees, while those of 1846 were only 52,000,000. The exports were as follows:—

	5 years ending December 31, 1846.	1846.
Cotton, . . bales . . . . .	380,987	257,743
Wool, . . lbs. . . . .	3,421,976	4,626,470
Coffee, . . lbs. . . . .	3,140,821	1,529,900
Pepper . . cwt. . . . .	47,260	46,182
Indigo, . . lbs. . . . .	135,833	55,928
Ivory . . cwt. . . . .	5,764	6 109

It has been seen how large was the export to India in the first six months of the year, and now we see by the newspapers of the day what are the consequences. Low as was the price of cotton, the speculation has not answered. The markets are glutted, and the prices are unremunerative. "Great caution," it is said, "must now be exercised, or the exporting houses will suffer exceedingly."\* The small rise in price has already caused many mills to commence working short-time, and the operatives in them are thus deprived of the power to purchase clothing. It is the most gambling, and most extraordinary system, and the most destructive to the interests of the agricultural population of the world that has ever been devised. The fever and the chill succeed each other with such rapidity that we are scarcely advised of the arrival of the one, before we see indications of the approach of the other. The cause of this difficulty of extending the sale of cotton in distant markets is to be found in the fact that the labour-cost of cloth so obtained is great. We have seen that the extension of the manufacture in this country for a few years following the passage of the tariff of 1828 was rapid, and that it then became almost stationary under the Compromise, yet the import not only did not increase but decreased until it reached the lowest point in the period of 1842-43. The labour-cost of clothing was steadily increasing, but as the tariff of 1842 came into operation the labour-cost diminished, and there arose a power to pay for finer cloths from abroad, and thus the import and manufacture increased together. If we desire to see the operation of this, we need only take a single farmer of Tennessee or Kentucky, who obtains 30 or 40 bushels of corn in return for the labour bestowed on an acre of land, and is happy to sell it at 20 cents per bushel,† when the price in Liverpool is 75 or 80 cents. Thirty-five bushels yield here \$7, which is about the cost of 70 yards of tolerable cotton-cloth, plain and printed, when received on his farm. To produce those 70 yards would require 20 pounds of cotton, or one-twentieth of the product of a well-cultivated acre. To convert those pounds into yards of cloth requires far less than half the capital, and half the labour required for their original production. Taking, however, the conversion at one half, and adding that proportion to the number of pounds, we obtain the equivalent of 30 pounds of raw cotton as the return for 35 bushels of corn, and yet that corn sells, at the place of consumption, for as much as would purchase almost a bale of cotton. It is obvious that though the money-price of the cloth is low, the labour-price is high, and it is by the latter that the power of consumption is measured. The cloth, too, is worthless. As far back as 1832, the quantity of flour required for the use of the cotton factories of England was stated at *forty-two millions of pounds*,‡ or almost as much as the weight of 100,000 bales of cotton, all of which is traded off as cotton, to the poor consumers of distant lands, who are thus defrauded and impoverished.

Bad as is even this, it is far from all the loss that is sustained. The corn is sent from the land, and the farmer loses the refuse. The land is impoverished, and its occupant is compelled to fly to other lands, to be again impoverished. *The loss from this source alone is far more than the value of all the imports into the Union, of every description, from all the manufacturing nations of the world.* The apparently cheap clothing is very dear. It is obtained at the cost of much labour, and of little value when obtained.

\* Morning Herald, November.

† "Tennessee grows more corn than any State of the Union. A few months since we took the liberty to ask a farmer from Tennessee who had a drove of hogs in our streets, the price of corn in the region from whence he came. He replied that it was worth ten cents, and wheat fifty cents a bushel."—*Augusta Chronicle*, May, 1849.

‡ McCulloch's Commercial Dictionary, article *Cotton*.

What is true of Tennessee and India, is equally so of the other parts of the world that are compelled to depend on England for supplies of cotton cloth. The poor Russian obtains less than a pound of cotton for a bushel of wheat, and thus he gives ten days' labour for one; whereas, if he could have cotton converted on the spot, by the man who ate his food, he would obtain day's labour for day's labour. So is it with the German, the South American, the Mexican, the Italian, the Spaniard, and the Turk. The system tends to prevent concentration and combination of action, and to diminish the value of labour throughout the world, and it is because of this, that almost all nations are endeavouring to shut out the manufactures of Great Britain. Everywhere, however, they are met by the smuggler, now regarded by the highest authorities of Great Britain as the greatest of reformers. Gibraltar is maintained for the purpose of smuggling goods into Spain. Exhausted Portugal receives millions of pounds of cotton goods, likewise to be smuggled into Spain; and thus is that unfortunate country kept in a state of poverty, because the people of England are pleased to believe that it is profitable to buy cloth produced abroad, while the labourer at home is idle for want of demand for his labour, and the food perishes on the ground for want of mouths to eat or roads to transport it.

If the system tends to the exhaustion of the people who have to buy cotton at so high a price, not less does it tend to the exhaustion of those who have to produce it, and who are compelled to sell at whatever price the people of England think proper to fix upon it. Why that is so, may, perhaps, be ascertained by an examination of the following table:—

Crop.	Stock in Liverpool, Dec. 31.		Price.	Gross proceeds of sales of American cotton in Liverpool, from which are to be deducted freights, commissions, &c. &c. Weight of bale estimated at 450 pounds.
		Bales.		
1837—1,422,000	.	158,000	7d.	\$49,000,000
1838—1,801,000	.	316,000	7	57,000,000
1839—1,360,000	.	242,000	7½	57,000,000
1840—2,177,000	.	403,000	6	55,000,000
1841—1,631,000	.	344,000	6½	45,000,000
1842—1,684,000	.	373,000	5½	47,000,000
1843—2,379,000	.	593,000	4½	47,000,000
1844—2,030,000	.	654,000	4½	49,000,000
1845—2,415,000	.	808,000	4½	51,000,000
1846—2,100,000	.	597,000	4½	56,000,000
1847—1,778,000	.	286,000	6½	51,000,000
1848—2,347,000	.	348,000	4½	45,000,000

The quotations of the latter portion of the last year were below the average, being about 4d., and about that point they remained for several months, until the chief portion of the crop had been shipped. The unfavourable prospects for the new crop tended to prevent a further fall, but it is impossible to tell what would have been the price had that of the present year increased in its proper ratio to the population engaged in its production. It would certainly have fallen much below even fourpence. An examination of this table will, I think, enable us to understand the cause of the present extraordinary state of things. A large portion of the crop of the present year has been destroyed by frosts, freshets, &c., and that fact, instead of bringing with it distress and ruin, has brought with it increased activity and life among planters, and increased power to consume cloth, sugar, coffee, &c. Why is it so? The answer can, I think, readily be given.

The amount that can be collected by Great Britain, in payment for American cotton, consumed at home and abroad, and for freights, commissions, &c., appears to be limited to somewhere between \$45,000,000 and \$57,000,000,



with an obvious tendency to diminution. Of the crop of the past four years, the quantity consumed among ourselves, and exported by us directly to foreign ports, has not varied materially from 1,000,000. The balance has gone to England, who has \$57,000,000 with which to pay for 900,000 bales, say \$63 a bale. The crop, however, reaches 2,400,000 bales, and we send her 1,400,000; all of which have to be compressed within a smaller sum than 57,000,000, for now there are large expenses for storage, interest, risk, &c., and the amount falls to 50,000,000, leaving the planter but \$36 a bale, out of which he has to pay the high freights consequent upon large crops, and upon a large number of bales, instead of that moderate freight that would have accompanied small ones, and upon a small number of bales. The price obtained in England fixes that of the crop, and the result is as follows:—

1,900,000 bales at \$63,	\$120,000,000
Less low freights, at home and abroad, upon a small quantity.	
2,400,000 bales at \$36,	\$86,000,000
Less high freights, at home and abroad, upon a large quantity.	

It is obvious that it would have been far better that the 500,000 bales should have been burned, or destroyed by frost before being picked. The crop of 1844 was 812,000,000 pounds, and the product was estimated at \$65,772,000. In 1845, it rose to 958,000,000, and the product fell to \$56,000,000. In 1847, it fell to 711,000,000, worth \$72,000,000. In 1848, it rose to 1,100,000,000, and until the occurrence of frosts and freshets, the prospect was that it would not average at New Orleans more than 5½ cents, or \$60,000,000.

The gradual but steady subjugation of the planters to the system may be seen from the following facts: From 1830 to 1835, the price of cotton here was about eleven cents, which we may suppose to be about what it would yield in England, free of freight and charges. In those years our average export was about 320,000,000, yielding about \$35,000,000, and the average price of cotton cloth, per piece of 24 yards, weighing 5 lbs. 12 oz., was 7s. 10d., (\$1.88,) and that of iron £6, 10s., (\$31.20.) Our exports would therefore have produced us, delivered in Liverpool, 18,500,000 pieces of cloth, or about 1,100,000 tons of iron. In 1845 and '46, the home consumption of the people of England was almost the same quantity, say 311,000,000 pounds, and the average price here was 6½ cents, making the product \$20,000,000. The price of cloth then was 6s. 6¼d., (\$1.57½,) and that of iron about £10, (\$48,) and the result was, that we could have, for nearly the same quantity of cotton, about 12,500,000 pieces of cloth, or about 420,000 tons of iron, delivered in Liverpool. Dividing the return between the two commodities, it stands thus:—

	Average from 1830 to 1835.	1845-6.	Loss.
Cloth, pieces,	9,250,000	6,250,000	3,000,000
And iron, tons,	550,000	210,000	340,000

The labour required for converting cotton into cloth had been greatly diminished, and yet the proportion retained by the manufacturers was greatly increased, as will now be shown:—

	Weight of Cotton used.	Weight of Cotton given to the planters.	Retained by the manufacturers.
1830 to 1835,	320,000,000	110,000,000	210,000,000
1845 and 1846,	311,000,000	74,000,000	237,000,000

In the first period, the planter would have had 34 per cent. of his cotton returned to him in the form of cloth, but in the second only 24 per cent. The grist miller gives the farmer from year to year a larger proportion of the product of his grain, and thus the latter has all the profit of every improvement. The cotton miller gives the planter from year to year a smaller portion of the cloth produced. The one miller comes daily nearer to the producer. The other goes daily farther from him, for with the increased product the cost of transportation is increased.

We may now inquire into the cause of the accumulation of stock in the English market, and if that can be ascertained, we shall be able to see why it is that cotton has fallen so ruinously low.

Of the crop of 1828-29, our own consumption was . . . 118,000

Of those of 1832-33 and 1833-34, the average was . . . 195,000

Of that of 1834-35, it was . . . 216,000

having almost doubled in six years, and with a tendency to an increase in the ratio of advance; and this increase was attended by no diminution in our consumption of foreign cloth.

Of the crop of 1841-42, we consumed only . . . 268,000  
with a great diminution in the consumption of foreign cloth.

Of that of 1847-48, . . . 607,000

with a large increase in the consumption of foreign cloth, the total consumption having much more than doubled in a similar period of time. In the period intermediate between 1835 and 1843, our consumption had been stationary. Had it not been interfered with by the action of the Compromise bill, it would certainly have doubled in that period, and probably much more than doubled. If, however, we assume an increase of only  $12\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. per annum, or quadruple the increase of population, the following would have been the home demand:—

1835-6 . . .	243,000 bales	1839-40 . . .	388,000 bales
1836-7 . . .	273,000 "	1840-41 . . .	437,000 "
1837-8 . . .	307,000 "	1841-42 . . .	491,000 "
1838-9 . . .	345,000 "		

Total . . . 2,484,000

The actual consumption was . . . 1,844,000

Difference . . . 640,000

The loss of demand to the planter was thus more than *the whole quantity* that was left unsold when the market broke down.

Following up the consumption to the present time at the same rate, we obtain the following results:—

1842-3 . . .	552,000 bales	1846-7 . . .	883,000 bales
1843-4 . . .	621,000 "	1847-8 . . .	994,000 "
1844-5 . . .	680,000 "	1848-9 . . .	1,019,090 "
1845-6 . . .	785,000 "		

5,550,000

The actual consumption has been about . . . 3,000,000

Difference in seven years, . . . 2,550,000

Total difference, . . . 3,190,000

No one can doubt that the progress would have been greater than is here set down, and yet with no more than this, we should have used above 3,000,000 bales that we have not used. Had we done so, the producer of cotton would have fixed the price and not the buyer. Under such circumstances would it have fallen below ten or twelve cents per pound? Would it not, on the contrary, have risen to fourteen or fifteen, unless the crop had been much increased? I think it would, and I feel assured that it will do so in a very brief period from the thorough adoption of a system

that will establish here such a market for labour as will enable us to consume on the land the products of the land, and my reasons for so believing are as follows :—

The good cotton lands of India are now waste. To render them productive requires labour and capital. To induce the application of either, the labourer must have wages and the owner of capital must have profits. Both must rise in price with any increased demand for them. Such demand must arise when England shall find herself compelled to look to India for any increased supply, as she must do so soon as our home demand shall have risen to the extent of 1,000,000 bales per annum, as it will do in the next three years, if permitted so to do.

It will be asked, what should we do with all this cloth? In reply, I say again, and I repeat it because it is essential that it be recollected—*every man is a consumer to the whole extent of his production, whatever that may be.* Had the tariff of 1828 remained unchanged, the production of coal in the same period would have reached 15,000,000 tons, for furnaces and rolling-mills would have been built throughout the country, and railroad bars would have been made by hundreds of thousands of tons, and treble the roads would have been made without producing bankruptcy. The demand for roads, and mills, and furnaces, and steam-engines of every description would have created a vast demand for labour that was wasted, and the surplus earnings would have gone to the purchase of clothing and other of the conveniences and comforts of life, and there would have been made a market on the land for the products of the land, to the extent of hundreds of millions of dollars, enabling both farmer and planter to improve the machinery of production and transportation, growing rich instead of remaining poor as they have done. With each such step the immigration from Europe would have increased, and as every man would at once have become a producer, every one would have been a consumer. The Englishman would consume twelve pounds, where before he consumed but four, and the Irishman would consume twelve where before he consumed but one, while freights to Europe would be so far reduced that the price of cotton in New York would be almost as high as in Liverpool.

It will be observed that the quantity here set down for 1846-7 exceeds, by only one-third, that which we actually did consume. Had immigration continued to increase, from 1834 to the present time, at the rate at which it was then advancing, our population would be greater than it now is by 20 per cent., providing for nearly the whole quantity, without any allowance for increased consumption by the population previously existing. The whole of them would have needed large supplies of coffee, silk, and a thousand other things from abroad, for much of which we should have paid in cotton goods. The facility of obtaining iron would have given roads to the farmer and planter, and all would have had more of the proceeds of their labour to apply to the purchase of clothing. The planter himself, and his people, would now be consuming three yards where now they consume but one; and the home-market would now be absorbing 1,200,000 bales, instead of a million. What then would be the price of cotton, even with a crop of 3,000,000? Would it not be \$60 a bale, yielding him 180 millions instead of 80? I think it would.

In 1845 and 1846, the planter supplied 311,000,000 of pounds, for which, *delivered on the sea-board*, he could have had 74,000,000 lbs. *delivered in Liverpool*, the freight and commissions, homeward, being paid by him. He gave 156,000,000 for 37,000,000, the charges upon which, without duty, would have reduced it to 30,000,000 on the plantation, and probably less. The 30,000,000 had, however, been twisted and woven, and the difference,




one hundred and twenty-six millions, was what he gave for the twisting and weaving of *thirty millions*. The average work of operatives, men and women, boys and girls, exceeds the conversion of 3000 pounds of cotton into such cloth, per annum. The planter, then, gave 126,000,000 of pounds of cotton for the labour of 10,000 persons, chiefly boys and girls, and he transported 156,000,000 to market. Were he to calculate the cost of transportation from the plantation to Nashville, or other place of shipment, he would find that that alone was far more than the labour he obtained in return, and that he had in fact given the cotton itself away, receiving for it no equivalent whatever.


Had the whole 156,000,000 been converted at home into cloth, it would have amounted to about seven pounds additional, per head, for the people of the Union, and it would then have been consumed at home, for the consumption of the South would then have risen to a level with the present consumption of the North, and the latter would have largely increased, because of the great demand for labour that would have existed. Had that been done, the price of the whole crop would have been 8*d.* instead of 4½*d.*, and the planter would have received seven cents per pound, *additional*, on 900,000,000 of pounds, or *sixty-three millions of dollars*—and that, large a sum as it is, is but a part of the benefit that would have resulted from such a course of operation.

It will be said that high prices would arrest consumption. If so, how important it is to the producer to cut off the enormous charges of the host of persons that now intervene between himself and those who desire to consume his products. High prices, consequent upon the maintenance of the existing system, do arrest it, because they are a tax upon both producer and consumer. Such prices realized by the former, consequent upon an increased facility of exchanging with the latter, would produce a contrary effect. They would increase it; for we should obtain more from all the world for what we had to sell, and our own consumption would increase more rapidly. The increasing emigration to this country would raise the value of man abroad, and those whom we now see expelling him from their lands, burning his house that he may not return, would then find themselves compelled to offer him inducements to remain. Agriculture would then improve and wages would rise, and the power to consume cotton, on both sides of the Atlantic, would grow, to the infinite advantage of the planter. With the increased demand, he would at length find something like certainty in place of the present gambling system under which he is so often nearly ruined. How little certainty he now can have, will be seen by the following diagrams, which I take from the circular of Messrs. Rathbone, Brothers, & Co., before referred to.

### *Fluctuations in the price of Cotton, in 1848.*



The following shows the variations, from 1844 to 1848, in the prices of cotton, twist, and cloth.



The highest and lowest lines show the comparative prices of yarn and cotton, the quotations being per lb. on the left of the tables. The middle line shows the fluctuations of a cotton long cloth, the quotations being per piece, on the right of the tables.

Here we see the price of cotton lowest when cloth is at the highest; and the manufacturers realizing fortunes, while the planter is being ruined. Such are the inevitable results of a system that forces almost all the cotton of the world into a market in which there is but a given amount to be exchanged against it, and in which the price of each pound is dependent entirely upon the relation which the whole mass bears to the constantly diminishing sum that can be spared to pay for it. It is a constantly shrinking Procrustean bed. While thus destroying the planter, and lessening his power to provide for his people, there is an unceasing abuse of him as an owner of slaves, and an unceasing threat to substitute the *free* labour of the wretched Hindoo for that of the well-fed, well-clothed, and well-housed labourer of the South, and the lower the price of cotton, the stronger is the determination to keep it low. Railroads are to be made in India, that cotton may come to market cheaply, and cotton cloth go more freely to that country; and yet with every step of increase in the export of cotton goods, the poor Hindoo becomes more and more enslaved, and more and more the victim of famine and pestilence.

The difference between twelve cents and eight cents per pound for cotton is, on an average, about one cent a yard. The consumption of Great Britain and Ireland is about fifteen yards per head, while the average of that of her colonies is about three. It is absurd to suppose that this difference could make any essential difference in the consumption of an article of the first importance, under natural circumstances; but if it could, how immense would be the difference in our home consumption that would result from the adoption of a system that would enable the farmers of Tennessee and Ohio to exchange produce with the planter—food for cotton—giving acre for acre, instead of, as now, bushels for pounds—the difference being swallowed up in the transit of the food and the cotton to and from Liverpool and Manchester.

The harmony of interests, throughout every part of the Union, is perfect, and all that is needed is, that all should understand it. What injures the farmer injures the planter; and *vice versa*, the planter cannot suffer without injury to the farmer. Throughout the South, planters are abandoning cotton and substituting wheat, and that at a moment when the European market

for food is to be closed against the hundreds of millions for which, *as it is asserted*, we now need a market.

As some may doubt the existence of this harmony, I propose now to show how the present course of action, as relates to food, tends to destroy the market for cotton.

The people of Germany and Russia, after feeding themselves, have food to sell. With the produce of that food they desire to buy cloth. The higher the price of the food they sell, the more cloth they can buy. The great food market, at present, is England. If we fill that market, the price of food will be low, and the German can buy little cotton. If we do not, it may be high, and he may buy much cotton. We are now converting labourers, miners, and mechanics into farmers, diminishing the consumers and increasing the producers. The more consumers we have, the less food we shall have to spare, the higher will be the price of food in England, and the greater will be the quantity of cotton that can be purchased by the German and the Russian. The more producers we have, the more food we shall have to sell, the lower will be its price, and the smaller will be the quantity of cotton that can be produced by the German and the Russian. All this seems to me so obviously true, that it needs only to be stated. It has been seen that the price of food is here maintained by a home demand resulting from the great immigration now taking place, and we know that if by causing a demand for labour for the building of furnaces and mills, and other similar works, we could cause the immigration to go next year to half a million, there would be a further demand for grain, that would carry prices to a point still higher. Let us now suppose the immigration of next year to be 600,000, producing a further increase of demand for food to the extent of twenty or thirty millions of dollars, and see what would be the effect upon the planter. The Canadian would find a market for his grain within the Union, for the price would be sufficiently high to enable him to pay the duty. The value of agricultural labour everywhere would rise with the increasing price of food; and every farmer, at home and abroad, would consume more cloth, because he could sell the products of his labour higher, *i. e.* he could obtain more cloth and iron for it. The German, the Russian, the Irishman and the Englishman would be larger customers than now, while the home demand would absorb enormous quantities that would otherwise go to England to augment "the stock on hand," by the size of which is measured the price to be paid for the ensuing crop.

Our present policy tends to destroy the home market and the foreign market too. It diminishes the productiveness of labour on both sides of the Atlantic, and all that is taken from the surplus that remains after feeding the labourer, is so much taken from the fund that would otherwise go to the purchase of cloth or iron.

#### THE TOBACCO PLANTER.

A brief examination of the tobacco trade will show precisely similar results. In 1822, we exported 83,000 hogsheads, and the price was \$74 82, yielding about \$6,200,000. In 1845, we exported 147,000 hogsheads, and the price was \$50, yielding \$7,350,000. Deducting the extra expense of transportation to the place of shipment, the producers received less for the large quantity than they had done for the small one. From 1830 to 1835, the export averaged 90,000, and the amount was \$6,200,000, yielding to the producer, on his plantation, as much as the larger quantity in 1845. The sum of \$6,200,000, at these two periods, would have brought in Liverpool:—



---

1830 to 1835, pieces of cloth,	3,300,000,	or tons of iron,	200,000
1845,	“ “	3,900,000	“ 130,000

---

The planter is giving almost two-thirds more of tobacco for twenty per cent. more cloth, although his brother planter is almost ruined by the low price of cotton; but in the case of iron it is worse, for he gives two-thirds *more* for thirty-five per cent. *less*. In the first period, he could have two and one-fifth tons for a hogshead; whereas in the last he has little more than one-third of the quantity, or seven-eighths of a ton. It is obvious that he is being taxed by somebody, that he is giving more and receiving less, and that the cause of this is, that the productive power enabling the people outside of the Union to pay for tobacco, does not keep pace with the power of those inside of the Union to produce it. What is his remedy? It is to increase the number of people inside of the Union, with whom he can have perfect freedom of trade. The Englishman will consume six pounds for one that he can now consume, burdened as it is with a tax of 3s. per pound; the German will do the same; and so will the Frenchman, when he can free himself from the tax imposed upon him by the government monopoly. The more men that are imported, the more will be transferred from the list of small customers to that of large ones, and the less will be the cost of transportation from the place of production in Maryland or Virginia, Ohio or Kentucky, to the place of consumption, Philadelphia or New York, Berlin or Vienna; for the larger the bulk and value of the commodities transported west, the lower will be the charge for transportation eastward. Between the interests of the tobacco planter, the manufacturer, and the ship-owner, there is therefore perfect harmony.

#### THE SUGAR PLANTER.

The sugar trade presents the same state of things. The agriculturists of the world are giving a constantly increasing quantity of labour as the equivalent of a constantly diminishing one. The following exhibit of the movement of the great sugar market, since the commencement of the present century, shows that the amount paid for sugar has been constantly diminishing, while the price of the English commodities given in exchange has varied in a degree so much less that whereas in 1801 the consumption of  $14\frac{2}{10}$  persons paid for a ton of iron, that of 24 was required in 1831, and the proportion has been steadily increasing. The whole sum paid in 1847 for this important article of food, by *twenty-nine millions* of people, was less than was paid in 1801 by sixteen millions, and the contribution per head was less than one-half, and yet the difference in the price of iron was, by comparison, trifling.\*

---

\* The case is the same in regard to all other of the products of the land. In 1841 and 1842, the colonial timber received in Great Britain averaged 931,000 loads. In 1846 and 1847, the average was 1,150,000 loads. In 1848, 1,102,000 loads. The price, meanwhile, had, however, fallen almost ten per cent.† and the colonist, after paying the extra freight, must have received less, in money, for the large than for the small quantity, while the price of iron had advanced fifty per cent. His timber would therefore yield him about forty per cent. less weight of iron to be employed in the further production of timber. The writer from whom I quote gives many other facts to show that the increased supplies have been obtained at “the same cost of labour,” or that means have been found “for making our [their] own industry more productive.”‡ It does not matter which, but of the two conditions he “prefers the former.” The former is the one, and being such it is scarcely to be wondered that the poor and over-taxed colonists desire annexation.

† Edinburgh Review, July, 1849.

‡ Ibid.

	Population.	Quantity retained for consumption.—cwt.	Price per cwt.	Total value consumed.	Price per head.	Price of iron.	Number of persons fed with sugar in exchange for a ton of iron.
1801	16,338,000	3,639,000*	45†	£8,188,000	10/2	£7 5†	14.2
1811	18,500,000	3,818,000*	41/6†	£7,888,000	8/6	£8†	18.8
1821	21,200,000	3,529,000*	34†	£6,000,000	5/8	£6 10†	23
1831	24,029,000	4,233,000	23/8†	£5,000,000	4/2	£5†	24

I do not extend this table, for Mr. Tooke's list of prices does not come down to the end of the next decennial period, and I have no other that appears to correspond with it. Enough, however, is given to show that the people of the United Kingdom were steadily giving less iron for more sugar. In 1801 the planter could have 1,100,000 tons as the equivalent of 180,000 tons; but in 1831 he could have but a million of tons as the equivalent of 210,000. From that time to the present there has been an unceasing effort to cheapen sugar, and yet there were taken for consumption (including the large quantity exported after being refined) in the years 1845 to 1847, only 15,900,000 cwts., or an average of 5,300,000, being only 45 per cent. more than in 1801, while the population had increased 90 per cent. It is obvious that the power of consumption diminishes, and yet the prices of the world are fixed in England. The consequence of this is seen in the fact that 5,800,000 tons, in 1847, would command but £7,200,000, while 3,600,000 in 1801 would command about £8,200,000.

The return to labour employed in the cultivation of cotton has fallen so low that the Carolinian tries wheat, and the Mississippian sugar. Sugar falls so low that the West Indian turns his attention to coffee. By the time his trees have become productive, the price has so far fallen that he cuts them down, and then the price rises, while that of sugar falls.§ Thus is it ever and everywhere. The producers are over-ridden by the exchangers, and so must they continue to be while they shall continue to have the price of their whole crops determined by that which can be obtained for a small surplus in the constantly diminishing market of England.

The production of sugar does not vary greatly from a million of tons, and the yield to the planter may be about \$70, the whole amount being about \$70,000,000. Taking the cotton crop at \$80,000,000, we have the sum of \$150,000,000 as the value of the labour of that large portion of the population of the world employed in producing these two articles, so essential to the comfort of the rest of the world. The equivalent of this sum in 1845 and 1846 might have been (delivered on the plantation) about 2,500,000 tons of iron, the article that, of all others, is most essential to the maintenance, or the increase, of the productive power.

A ton of bar iron is not the equivalent of twenty-five days' labour, properly employed among the coal and iron fields of the Union, but even at that rate, one man would give more than twelve tons per annum. To produce the whole quantity required to pay for the cotton and sugar crops of the world would require, then, the labour of 200,000 men. Is it not obvious that the agriculturists of the world are taxed to a vast amount for the support

\* Porter's Progress of the Nation, Vol. III. page 32.

† Tooke's History of Prices, Vol. II. page 413. Mr. Tooke gives the various prices of the year. I have taken what appears to me to be the average.

‡ Ibid. p. 406.

§ From this cause it is that coffee is now scarce and high, and sugar abundant and cheap, the price of the latter in London being but about 24s. How much is left for the poor producer that has paid freight from Benares, far up the Ganges, and all the charges of all the persons through whose hands it has passed, may readily be imagined. Twenty pounds of sugar must be required to pay for one of cotton, in the form of coarse cloth.

of the fleets and armies, the merchants and brokers, the paupers and the noblemen of Great Britain, and is it not incumbent upon them to free themselves from such a state of vassalage? To *add* to the present annual production of the Union in the next seven years, *the whole quantity* of iron required to pay for the cotton and sugar crops of the world would require not the slightest effort, and so far would it be from diminishing the supply of food, or cotton, that the production of both would increase at a rate more rapid than was ever before known, for the farmer and the planter would thus obtain a market on the land for the products of the land, and good roads to go to distant markets, and the chief part of the time and labour now wasted in the work of transportation might be given to the work of cultivation. We should then import hundreds of thousands of men to make roads through the States already organized, instead of exporting hundreds of thousands to California, and then squandering our resources in the premature effort to make a road by which to communicate with them.

It is time for the cotton planter to look this question fully in the face. Had he a market, he could in a brief period increase the crop to 5,000,000 of bales. Having no market, he is compelled to limit the cultivation, and thus it is that the product of such a region as South Alabama does not increase. In 1839 it yielded, bales, . . . . . 551,000

From 1845 to the present time the average has been only 440,000\*

The people who should be raising cotton, or making iron, are perpetually on the move, producing nothing. The picture presented in the following paragraph, taken from one of the papers of the day, is the one that meets our eyes look where we may:—

“The tide of emigration continues to pour through our city southward and westward with increasing volume. The rush is tremendous. Throughout the day, from early dawn until late at night, long trains of wagons, families, and forces are seen moving through our streets. Both our ferries are kept in continual operation. Mr. Fairhurst, one of the proprietors of the lower ferry, has kept a memorandum of the movers crossing at that point during the last two weeks. In that time *three hundred and fifteen wagons* have crossed the river, of which number 214 were bound for Texas, 89 for the southern counties of our own State, and 12 for Louisiana. It is estimated that, counting whites and blacks, there are about five persons to each wagon. This would show that within the last fourteen days about fifteen hundred movers have passed this one ferry. We have no record of the number crossing at the upper ferry, but if it is as large as the lower, the number of movers passing through our city during the present month will be about *six thousand!*”  
—*Little Rock (Arkansas) Democrat, Nov. 16.*

Those men are flying from the rich and unoccupied soils of lower Carolina and South Alabama to the high lands of Arkansas and Texas, thus increasing their necessity for transportation, and diminishing their power to obtain it. Let them fly as they may, they cannot fly so fast as to prevent the increase of the cotton crop, the average of which must soon stand at 3,000,000 of bales; but where then shall the planter find a market? Among the sugar planters of the world? Like himself, they are ruined for want of a market. Among the coffee growers? Like himself, they are ruined for want of a market. Among the wheat growers? The Russian wastes his crop for want of a market, and the American is competing with him for the possession of that of England, while the Englishman is ruined by competition with both.† Is it among the operatives of England? They are

\* De Bow's Commercial Review, Vol. VII. page 446.

† The following passage from one of the journals of the day, presents a tolerably correct view of the course of things in Great Britain. The producers are being ruined, and all are becoming consumers, and thus it is that Ireland, exclusively agricultural, furnishes a market for food. It is forgotten, however, that every diminution in the amount of pro-



endeavouring to underwork the Hindoo, and their power to purchase cotton or sugar diminishes daily. They need a market for their labour. Is it in France? France is always at war, and produces little. Her consumption of American cotton in 1842 and 1843 was 717,000 bales. In 1846 and 1847, only 575,000.\*

Look where he may, he must see that the producers of the world want markets, and that for want of them they are becoming poorer instead of richer, and that their power to obtain even the machinery of production is daily diminishing, the price of iron in sugar, coffee, cotton, wheat, indigo, or any other of the products of the earth, tending steadily upward, and yet there is no single commodity in the world that would tend to fall so steadily, but for the existence of *the monopoly system*. The supply might be increased to an indefinite amount, and with a rapidity far exceeding that of any other of the products of the earth. Make a market for it requiring annually 10,000,000 of tons, and this country could supply it in ten years. Double or treble it, and we could supply the whole in reasonable time, for our capacity is without limit, and we could command the services of half the labourers of Europe. Here it is, *and here alone*, that the planter can look for a market capable of expanding itself in the ratio of the increase in his power to furnish supplies. Here, and here alone, can the market for coffee, silk, indigo, and all other of the products of the world be so far enlarged as to enable the coffee planter, and the cultivator of silk and indigo to quadruple their consumption of cotton.

## CHAPTER ELEVENTH.

### HOW PROTECTION AFFECTS THE LANDOWNER.

THE great saving fund is the land, and it is by the almost insensible contribution of labour that it acquires value. The first object of the poor cultivator of the thin soils is to obtain food and clothing for himself and his family. His leisure is given to the work of improvement. At one place he cuts a little drain, and at another he roots out a stump. At one moment he cuts fuel for his family, and thus clears his land, and at another digs

duction diminishes the amount of commodities that can be given as the equivalent of the products of others, and that those who buy food have little to give for clothing, and must go in rags:—

“The prospect of an Irish demand for corn is improving, and also that the dependence of England, on foreign supplies, will gradually increase. The land monopoly of England, by adding the item of rent to be paid by the occupier and producer, made requisite a tax on the foreign article, which should protect him against the proprietary producers abroad, who had no rent to pay. The removal of this tax has now thrown directly upon the English farmer the whole burden of his rent, which was before borne by all consumers of bread. This burden will be enhanced, by the abrogation of the navigation laws, which, by diminishing freights, will make the competition between the cheap rentless lands of other countries, and the landlord-burdened soil of England, more severe, and, as a consequence, much of the poorer soils will be abandoned, while the expensive system of culture before resorted to, to increase the quantity of protected corn, must be relinquished as unprofitable. A considerable diminution in the product of a *good* English harvest, as compared with former years, may then freely be looked for. We have given above an official table of the quantity of food taken for consumption in England, for the year ending August, 1849. That was in aid of the harvest of 1848, which was “good,” but the acreable product, from causes alluded, could not have been as large as usual. The result of this is, that the small farmers, with small crops at low prices, cannot meet tithes, taxes, poor rates, and rent, the last the most onerous; and their capital and numbers are annually diminishing, swelling the numbers of bread-consumers in other employments.”

\* Merchants' Magazine, Vol. XVII. page 562

a well to facilitate the watering of his cattle, and thus keep his manure in the stable-yard. He knows that the machine will feed him better the more perfectly he fashions it, and that there is always place for his time and his labour to be expended with advantage to himself.

The land was given to man for his use, and the basis of the whole science of political economy is to be found in the law which governs his relation with this great and only machine of production. Mr. Ricardo taught that in the infancy of society men could command rich soils, from which they could obtain an abundant supply of food; but that with the growth of population food became more scarce, producing a necessity for dispersion in quest of those rich soils. The common sense of mankind teaches the contrary, and in this case, as in all others, the common sense of the many is right, while the uncommon sense of the few is wrong, as will be seen by all who will take the trouble to follow out the following sketch\* of the gradual occupation of the earth:—

“The first cultivator commences his operations on the hill-side. Below him are lands upon which have been carried, by force of water, the richer portions of those above, as well as the leaves of trees, and the fallen trees themselves; all of which have there, from time immemorial, rotted and become incorporated with the earth, and thus have been produced soils fitted to yield the largest returns to labour: yet for this reason are they inaccessible. Their character exhibits itself in the enormous trees with which they are covered, and in their power of retaining the water necessary to aid the process of decomposition; but the poor settler wants the power either to clear them of their timber, or to drain them of the superfluous moisture. He begins on the hill-side, but at the next step we find him descending the hill, and obtaining larger returns to labour. He has more food for himself, and he has now the means of feeding a horse or an ox. Aided by the manure that is thus yielded to him by the better lands, we see him next retracing his steps, improving the hill-side, and compelling it to yield a return double that which he at first obtained. With each step down the hill he obtains still larger reward for his labour, and at each he returns, with increased power, to the cultivation of the original poor soil. He has now horses and oxen, and while by their aid he extracts from the new soils the manure that had accumulated for ages, he has also carts and wagons to carry it up the hill: and at each step his reward is increased, while his labours are lessened. He goes back to the sand and raises the marl, with which he covers the surface; or he returns to the clay and sinks into the limestone, by aid of which he doubles its product. He is all the time making a machine which feeds him while he makes it, and which increases in its powers the more he takes from it. At first it was worthless. It has fed and clothed him for years, and now it has a large value, and those who might desire to use it would pay him a large rent.

“The earth is a great machine, given to man to be fashioned to his purpose. The more he fashions it the better it feeds him, because each step is but preparatory to a new one more productive than the last; requiring less labour and yielding larger return. The labour of clearing is great, yet the return is small. The earth is covered with stumps, and filled with roots. With each year the roots decay and the ground becomes enriched, while the labour of ploughing is diminished. At length the stumps disappear, and the return is doubled, while the labour is less by one-half than at first. To forward this process the owner has done nothing but crop the ground: nature having done the rest. The aid he thus obtains from her yields him

---

\* Originally published in my book. “The Past, the Present, and the Future.”

as much food as in the outset was obtained by the labour of felling and destroying the trees. This, however, is not all. The surplus thus yielded has given him means for improving the poorer lands by furnishing manure with which to enrich them, and thus he has trebled his original return without further labour; for that which he saves in working the new soils suffices to carry the manure to the old ones. He is obtaining a daily increased power over the various treasures of the earth.

“With every operation connected with the fashioning of the earth, the result is the same. The first step is, invariably, the most costly one, and the least productive. The first drain commences near the stream, where the labour is heaviest. It frees from water but a few acres. A little higher, the same quantity of labour, profiting by what has been already done, frees twice the number. Again the number is doubled, and now the most perfect system of thorough drainage may be established with less labour than was at first required for one of the most imperfect kind. To bring the line into connection with the clay, upon fifty acres, is lighter labour than was the clearing of a single one, yet the process doubles the return for each acre of the fifty. The man who wants a little fuel for his own use, expends much labour in opening the neighbouring vein of coal. To enlarge this, so as to double the product, is a work of comparatively small labour; as is the next enlargement, by which he is enabled to use a drift wagon, giving him a return fifty times greater than was obtained when he used only his arms, or a wheelbarrow. To sink a shaft to the first vein below the surface, and erect a steam-engine, are expensive operations; but these once accomplished every future step becomes more productive, while less costly. To sink to the next vein below and to tunnel to another, are trifles in comparison with the first, yet each furnishes a return equally large. The first line of railroad runs by houses and towns occupied by one or two hundred thousand persons. Half a dozen little branches, costing together far less labour than the first, bring into connexion with it three hundred thousand, or perhaps half a million. The trade increases, and a second track, a third, or a fourth, may be required. The original one facilitates the passage of the materials and the removal of obstructions, and three new ones may now be made with less labour than was required for the first.

“All labour thus expended in fashioning the great machine, is but the prelude to the application of further labour with still increased returns. With each such application wages rise, and hence it is that portions of the machine, as it exists, invariably exchange, when brought to market, for far less labour than they have cost. The man who cultivated the thin soils was happy to obtain a hundred bushels for his year’s work. With the progress of himself and his neighbour down the hill into the more fertile soils, wages have risen, and two hundred bushels are now required. His farm will yield a thousand bushels; but it requires the labour of four men, who must have two hundred bushels each, and the surplus is but two hundred bushels. At twenty years’ purchase this gives a capital of four thousand bushels, or the equivalent of twenty years’ wages; whereas it has cost, in the labour of himself, his sons, and his assistants, the equivalent of a hundred years of labour, or perhaps far more. During all this time, however, it has fed and clothed them all, and the farm has been produced by the insensible contributions made from year to year, unthought of and unfelt.

“It is now worth twenty years’ wages, because its owner has for years taken from it a thousand bushels annually; but when it had lain for centuries accumulating wealth, it was worth nothing. Such is the case with the earth everywhere. The more that is taken from it, the more there is left. When the coal mines of England were untouched, they were valueless.



Now their value is almost countless; yet the land contains abundant supplies for thousands of years. Iron ore, a century since, was a drug, and leases were granted at almost nominal rents. Now, such leases are deemed equivalent to the possession of large fortunes, notwithstanding the great quantities that have been removed, although the amount of ore now known to exist is probably fifty times greater than it was then.

*"The earth is the sole producer.* Man fashions and exchanges. A part of his labour is applied to the fashioning of the great machine, and this produces changes that are permanent. The drain, once cut, remains a drain; and the limestone, once reduced to lime, never again becomes limestone. It passes into the food of man and animals, and ever after takes its part in the same round with the clay with which it has been incorporated. The iron rusts and gradually passes into soil, to take its part with the clay and the lime. That portion of his labour gives him wages while preparing the machine for greater future production. That other portion which he expends on fashioning and exchanging *the products* of the machine, produces temporary results, and gives him wages alone. Whatever tends, therefore, to diminish the quantity of labour necessary for the fashioning and exchanging of the products, tends to increase the quantity that may be given to increasing the amount of products, and to preparing the great machine; and thus, while increasing the present return to labour, preparing for a future further increase.

"The first poor cultivator obtains a hundred bushels for his year's wages. To pound this between two stones requires twenty days of labour, and the work is not half done. Had he a mill in the neighbourhood he would have better flour, and he would have almost his whole twenty days to bestow upon his land. He pulls up his grain. Had he a scythe, he would have more time for the preparation of the machine of production. He loses his axe, and it requires days of himself and his horse on the road, to obtain another. His machine loses the time and the manure, both of which would have been saved, had the axe-maker been at hand. The real advantage derived from the mill and the scythe, and from the proximity of the axe-maker, consists simply in the power which they afford him to devote his labour more and more to the preparation of the great machine of production, and such is the case with all the machinery of preparation and exchange. The plough enables him to do as much in one day as with a spade he could do in five. He saves four days for drainage. The steam-engine drains as much as without it could be drained by thousands of days of labour. He has more leisure to marl or lime his land. The more he can extract from his machine the greater is its value, because every thing he takes is, by the very act of taking it, fashioned to aid further production. The machine, therefore, improves by use; whereas spades, and ploughs, and steam-engines, and all other of the machines used by man, are but the various forms into which he fashions parts of the great original machine, to disappear in the act of being used; as much so as food, though not so rapidly. The earth is the great labour savings' bank, and the value to man of all other machines is in the direct ratio of their tendency to aid him in increasing his deposits in the only bank whose dividends are perpetually increasing, while its capital is perpetually doubling. That it may continue for ever so to do, all that it asks is that it shall receive back the refuse of its produce, the manure; and that it may do so, the consumer and the producer must take their places by each other. That done, every change that is effected becomes permanent, and tends to facilitate other and greater changes. The whole business of the farmer consists in making and improving soils, and the earth

rewards him for his kindness by giving him more and more food the more attention he bestows upon her.

The solitary settler has to occupy the spots that, with his rude machinery, he *can* cultivate. Having neither horse nor cart, he carries home his crop upon his shoulders, as is now done in many parts of India. He carries a hide to the place of exchange, distant, perhaps, fifty miles, to obtain for it leather or shoes. Population increases, and roads are made. More fertile soils are cultivated. The store and the mill come nearer to him, and he obtains shoes and flour with the use of less machinery of exchange. He has more leisure for the preparation of his great machine, and the returns to labour increase. More people now obtain food from the same surface, and new places of exchange appear. The wool is, on the spot, converted into cloth, and he exchanges directly with the clothier. The saw-mill is at hand, and he exchanges with the sawyer. The tanner gives him leather for his hides, and the paper-maker gives him paper for his rags. With each of these changes he has more and more of both time and manure to devote to the preparation of the great food-making machine, and with each year the returns are larger. His *power to command* the use of the machinery of exchange increases, but his *necessity* therefor diminishes; for with each year there is an increasing tendency towards having the consumer placed side by side with the producer; and with each he can devote more and more of his time and mind to the business of fashioning the great instrument; and thus the increase of consuming population is essential to the progress of production.

"The loss from the use of machinery of exchange is in the ratio of the bulk of the article to be exchanged. Food stands first; fuel, next; stone for building, third; iron, fourth; cotton, fifth; and so on; diminishing until we come to laces and nutmegs. The raw material is that in the production of which the earth has most co-operated, and by the production of which the land is most improved; and the nearer the place of exchange or conversion can be brought to the place of production, the less is the loss in the process, and the greater the power of accumulating wealth for the production of further wealth.

"The man who raises food on his own land is building up the machine for doing so to more advantage in the following year. His neighbour, to whom it is *given*, on condition of sitting still, loses a year's work on his machine, and all he has gained is the pleasure of doing nothing. If he has employed himself and his horses and wagon in bringing it home, the same number of days that would have been required for raising it, he has misemployed his time, for his farm is unimproved. He has wasted labour and manure. As nobody, however, gives, it is obvious that the man who has a farm and obtains his food elsewhere, must pay for raising it, and pay also for transporting it; and that although he may have obtained as good wages in some other pursuit, his farm, instead of having been improved by a year's cultivation, is worse by a year's neglect; and that he is a poorer man than he would have been had he raised his own food.

"The article of next greatest bulk is fuel. While warming his house, he is clearing his land. He would lose by sitting idle, if his neighbour brought his fuel to him, and still more if he had to spend the same time in hauling it, because he would be wearing out his wagon and losing the manure. Were he to hire himself and his wagon to another for the same quantity of fuel he could have cut on his own property, he would be a loser, for his farm would be uncleared.

"If he take the stone from his own fields to build his house, he gains doubly. His house is built, and his land is cleared. If he sit still and let

his neighbour bring him stone, he loses, for his fields remain unfit for cultivation. If he work equally hard for a neighbour, and receive the same apparent wages, he is a loser by the fact that he has yet to remove the stones, and until they shall be removed he cannot cultivate his land.

“With every improvement in the machinery of exchange there is a diminution in the proportion which that machinery bears to the mass of production, because of the extraordinary increase of product consequent upon the increased power of applying labour to building up the great machine. It is a matter of daily observation that the demand for horses and men increases as railroads drive them from the turnpikes, and the reason is, that the farmer’s means of improving his land increase more rapidly than men and horses for his work. The man who has, thus far, sent to market his half-fed cattle, accompanied by horses and men to drive them, and wagons and horses loaded with hay or turnips with which to feed them on the road, and to fatten them when at market; now fattens them on the ground, and sends them by railroad ready for the slaughter-house. His use of the machinery of exchange is diminished nine-tenths. He keeps his men, his horses and his wagons, and the refuse of his hay or turnips, at home. The former are employed in ditching and draining, while the latter fertilizes the soil heretofore cultivated. His production doubles, and he accumulates rapidly, while the people around him have more to eat, more to spend in clothing, and accumulate more themselves. He wants labourers in the field, and they want clothes and houses. The shoemaker and the carpenter, finding that there exists a demand for their labour, now join the community, eating the food on the ground on which it is produced; and thus the machinery of exchange is improved, while the quantity required is diminished. The quantity of flour consumed on the spot induces the miller to come and eat his share, while preparing that of others. The labour of exchanging is diminished, and more is given to the land, and the lime is now turned up. *Tons* of turnips are obtained from the same surface that before gave *bushels* of rye. The quantity to be consumed increases faster than the population, and more mouths are needed on the spot, and next the woollen mill comes. The wool no longer requires wagons and horses, which now are turned to transporting coal, to enable the farmer to dispense with his woods, and to reduce to cultivation the fine soil that has, for centuries, produced nothing but timber. Production again increases, and the new wealth now takes the form of the cotton-mill; and, with every step in the progress, the farmer finds new demands on the great machine he has constructed, accompanied with increased power on his part to build it up higher and stronger, and to sink its foundations deeper. He now supplies beef and mutton, wheat, butter, eggs, poultry, cheese, and every other of the comforts and luxuries of life, for which the climate is suited; and from the same land which afforded, when his father or grandfather first commenced cultivation on the light soil of the hills, scarcely sufficient rye or barley to support life.”

If we undertake to study anywhere the cause of value in land, it will be found to result from diminution in the cost of transportation. The newspapers of the day, in speaking of the operations of the railroad recently constructed from Springfield (Illinois) to the Illinois river, tell us that

“One week before the railroad was finished, corn could be had here in any quantity, at 15 cents a bushel. Not a bushel can now,” says the *Saugamon Journal*, “be had for less than 25 cents. This,” it adds, “is the effect of the completion of the railroad on the price of one article of the products of our farmers.”

The first thing to be paid by land is transportation. When that is so great as to eat up the whole proceeds, the land will remain uncultivated



Diminish the cost of transportation so as to leave sufficient to pay the wages of labour, and it will be cultivated, but it will pay no rent. Diminish it further, so as to leave a surplus over and above the reward of the labourer, and the land itself will acquire value. Diminish it still further, by removing altogether the necessity for transportation, making a market on the land for all the products of the land, enabling the farmer readily to return to it all the refuse of its products, and it will acquire the highest value of which land is capable. The commodity of which the government and people of the Union have most to sell is land. In quantity it is practically unlimited, and long before our present territory shall have been even laid out for sale, vast countries will have been brought within the limits of the Union. In quality it is entitled to stand first in the world. The area of the coal region is 133,000 square miles. Iron ore is everywhere, untouched. Copper, zinc, and almost all other metals abound. South Carolina has millions of acres of the finest meadow-land unoccupied, and she has lime and iron ore in unlimited abundance. Virginia is in a similar condition, and yet people are leaving both, when population is all that is needed to place them in the first rank among the States of the Union in point of wealth. Of the three States of Alabama, Louisiana, and Mississippi, with advantages unrivalled for the production of the great clothing material of the world, two-thirds of their whole surface, or 83,000,000 of acres, yet remain unsold. The land at the command of the government counts by hundreds of millions, and to give to all this value we need only population.

In Europe, on the contrary, population is held to be superabundant. Marriage is regarded as a luxury, not to be indulged in, lest it should result in increase of numbers. "Every one," it is said, "has a right to live," but this being granted, it is added that "no one has a right to bring creatures into life to be supported by other people."\* Poor laws are denounced, as tending to promote increase of population—as a machine for supporting those who do not work "out of the earnings of those who do."† No man, it is thought, has "a right" to claim to have a seat at the great table provided by the Creator for all mankind, or that "if he is willing to work he must be fed." Labour is held to be a mere "commodity," and if the labourer cannot sell it, he has no "right" but to starve—himself, his wife, and his children. "The particular tendency to error apparent in the prevalent social philosophy of the day," to which it is deemed necessary to direct special attention, is "the unsound, exaggerated, and somewhat maudlin tenderness with which it is now the fashion to regard paupers and criminals."‡ Such are the doctrines of the free-trade school of England, in which Political Economy is held to be limited to an examination of the laws which regulate the production of wealth, without reference to either morals or intellect. Under such teaching it is matter of small surprise that pauperism and crime increase at a rate so rapid.§

Throughout Europe, men are held in low esteem. They are considered to be surplus, and the sooner they can be expelled the better it will be for those who can afford to remain behind. To accomplish this object, Colonization Societies are formed, and Parliament is memorialized by men who desire to export their fellow-men by hundreds of thousands annually. Whig and Tory journals|| unite in urging the necessity for expelling man from the

\* J. S. Mill's Principles of Political Economy.

† Edinburgh Review, October, 1849.

‡ Ibid.

§ See article on Transportation, Blackwood's Magazine, November, 1849.

|| The number of Blackwood's Magazine, just received, advocates the application of £300,000 per annum to this object.

land of Britain. Secretaries of State furnish ingenious calculations as to the amount required for accomplishing the work of expulsion. On all hands, it is agreed that men are too numerous, and that their numbers grow too fast, and yet there is not a country in Europe that can justly complain of over-population. Ireland, the type of this *free-trade* system, has millions of acres of her richest lands as yet untouched, that would alone, if drained, yield food in abundance for the whole population.

It is not, however, the labourer alone that stands in need of aid. The condition of the land-owner is little better. This system of universal discord is thus described in one of the journals\* of the day:

"The state of the country is frightful. The assassinations are computed at more than ten per week, half a hundred per month, which, added to the systematic starvation of almost another hundred, in the same time, gives a state of things without parallel in modern civilization. With this diminution of the people, the million of work-house inmates and dependents increases. In less than a month it will be more than a proprietor's life is worth to be seen by his tenantry. Rents, which of course are nominal in collection, have, therefore, lately sunk to the fourth of their nominal amount. Lands, let hitherto at £2 10s. per acre, are offered at less than 15s; and such is the exasperation of the starving millions, that the landlords are afraid further to aggravate their sufferings."

The Parliament of England is now engaged in passing laws to transfer, for the fourth time in little more than two centuries, the mass of Irish property to English undertakers. The little cultivator of land has been ruined. Labour has become utterly valueless, although labour alone is needed to bring into cultivation 7,000,000 of acres of the richest soils in the world, now unproductive.

The land-owner of India has been ruined. The immense body of village proprietors that but half a century since existed in that country, helping and governing themselves, has disappeared.

The land-owner of the West Indies—of Demerara and Berbice—has been ruined, and the condition of the labourers has not been improved.

The land-owner of Portugal—the continental colony of Great Britain—has been ruined, and with diminished value of land there has been steady deterioration of civilization, until the name of Portugal has become almost synonymous with weakness and barbarism.

If we look to Canada, Nova Scotia, or New Brunswick, the same picture meets our view. "Land of the same quality, at one minute north of the imaginary line dividing the provinces from the Union, is worth less than half as much as that which is one minute south of it. Lord Durham, in his report, made but a few years since, says that "land in Vermont and New Hampshire, close to the line, is five dollars per acre, and in the adjoining British townships, only one dollar," and that on the northern side of the line, with superior fertility, it is "wholly unsaleable even at such low prices." Canada has no market on the land for the products of the land, and the cost of transportation eats up the product, much of which is absolutely wasted because it cannot go at all to market. The labour of men, women, and children, and that of wagons and horses, is everywhere being wasted, and therefore it is that the Canadian desires a change of government that will enable him to obtain a protective tariff. Give him that—annex him to the Union—and his land will acquire value similar to that of the Union. Farmers will then grow rich, and labourers will grow rich, and the power to consume cloth and iron will grow with the same rapidity with which it recently grew with us.

Every colony of England would gladly separate from her, feeling that connection with her is synonymous with deterioration of condition. Every one would gladly unite its fortunes with those of our Union, feeling that

connection with us is synonymous with improvement. The reason for all this is, that the English system is based upon cheap labour, and tends to depress the many for the benefit of the few. In our system, it is the many who govern; and experience having taught them that prosperity and free trade with England are inconsistent with each other, we have "free trade" tariffs with protective duties of thirty per cent., and likely to be increased. The colonies are ruined by free trade, and they desire annexation, that they may have protection.

This idea of cheap labour is universal among English colonists. It is found in all their books. If they fail to succeed, it is because labour is "too high." They are willing to receive convicts, because they can be had "cheap." They tell their correspondents that men may be had from the Continent who will work for small wages, while Englishmen must have large ones, *i. e.* enough to feed and clothe themselves comfortably. They emancipate the negroes, and then they find their labour "too dear," and send to India, or to the coast of Africa, for "cheap" labourers. The *Times* informs us that the great works of England are based upon an ample supply of "cheap labour." The whole system looks to the degradation of the labourer, by requiring him to underwork and supplant the labourer of other countries, with all the disadvantage of distance and heavy cost of transportation. Protection looks to raising the value of labour, and thus promoting the annexation of individuals, and the establishment of perfect free trade between ourselves and the people of Europe by inducing them to transfer themselves to our shores. It is a bounty on the importation of the machine we need—man—to give value to the machine we have in such abundance—land. It leads to perfect free trade—the annexation of nations—by raising the value of man throughout the world.

It has been, at times, matter of surprise that the hundreds of thousands who have arrived in this country have been so instantly absorbed that their presence has been unfelt, and that the more we received, the larger was the quantity of food, fuel, cloth, and iron given in exchange for labour, but such is the natural result of a system which tends to enable the miner and the worker in iron, the spinner and the weaver, to combine their exertions with those of the farmer and planter. Had the policy of 1828 remained unchanged, and were we now receiving a million of men, the only effect that would be observed, would be that wages and profits, and the power of labourer, landowner, and capitalist, to command the good things of life would be steadily increasing, and with each step forward the tendency to immigration and to increase in the value of land would grow with accelerated pace. We need population.

In the thorough adoption of this course by the people of the Union, is to be found the remedy of the ills of both the land-owners and the labourers of the rest of the world, and the removal of the discords now so universal. That we may clearly see how it would contribute towards producing harmony, we must first inquire into the causes of discord.

The labourers of the world have one common interest, and that is that labour should become everywhere productive and valuable. The more wheat produced in return to a given quantity of labour, the more of it will the shoemaker obtain for his work, and the more advantageously the shoemaker can apply his labour, the more readily will the farmer provide himself and his family with shoes. Such, likewise, is the case with nations. It is to the interest of all that labour in all should become productive, and if the labour of the cotton-growing nation become unproductive, that of the sugar or wheat-growing nation feels the effect in an increased difficulty of obtaining clothing.



The land-owners of the world have one common interest, and that is, that land should everywhere become productive and valuable. It does so become with every increase in the skill and intelligence of the labourer, as may be seen by a comparison of times present with times past in every improving country, or by a comparison of the various countries of the world at the present moment. In Russia land itself has little value. In Belgium, where cultivation is carried on with intelligence elsewhere unknown, it has great value.

Every increase in the facility of obtaining cloth for food, or food for cotton, diminishes the quantity of labour to be given for food or clothing, and enables the producer to obtain other commodities and things needed for the improvement of his mind, or which tend to enable him more advantageously to apply his labour. The landed proprietor of England is therefore directly interested in the improvement of the mode of cultivating cotton in the United States, because it tends to improve the condition of the man who labours on his land; and the cotton-grower is interested in the improvement of the wheat-grower of Russia, because the latter is thereby enabled to purchase more clothing.

Among the land-owners and labourers of the world there is, therefore, perfect harmony of interests. Between them stand the men employed in the work of transportation, conversion and exchange—ship-owners, manufacturers, and merchants.

The object had in view in the prohibition of manufactures in the colonies was that of compelling the colonists to use ships that they would not otherwise require, and to pay manufacturers and merchants for doing for them those things that they could have better done themselves. The necessary consequence of this was discord, which in our case led to war, and vast waste of time and money. Another consequence was, that the people engaged in the work of transportation, conversion, and exchange, increased more rapidly than the producers, and England, from having food to sell, became a purchaser of foreign food. Next came the corn-laws, by which the importation of food was to be prevented, for the benefit of land-owners, and other laws prohibiting the export of machinery, for the benefit of the owners of ships and machinery of various kinds. By the one the owners of land were enabled to tax the labourer and the mechanic, and by the other the mechanic was enabled to tax the world in return. The effect has been that of preventing the application of English labour and capital to the work of production, and driving it into the far less profitable work of transportation, conversion, and exchange, to such an extent that the converters have at length become masters of the land-owners, and have abolished restrictions on the import of food which the latter had established for their protection, and as revolutions never go backward, we may fairly conclude that the corn-laws will not be re-established. The result, thus far, has been to ruin the landholders of Ireland, and the next result must be to ruin those of England, if the system be allowed fair play.

The people of Russia, we are assured, have been compelled to waste food for want of a market. Rather than do this, they would give a bushel of wheat for a yard of cloth. That they cannot afford to do this, we are assured; but what else can they do? If they cannot make cloth they must buy it, and they must give an equivalent, and if that be even bushels for yards, they must give them. Until Russia can make a market for this now surplus food, it will seek a market at any price, and the price in England cannot much exceed the cost of transportation between the farm on which it was produced and the town at which it is consumed. Nearly the whole of that price must go to the exchanger, to the loss of both land and labour,

both of which must tend towards the Russian level, now a very low one, because of the absence of a market on the land for the products of the land.

The object of the now dominant class in England is that of bringing about free trade with the world. Such a measure adopted by this country would close every furnace and rolling-mill, and every cotton and woollen factory in the country, and would diminish the value of both labour and land, by compelling the producer of food to seek a market in England. Similar measures adopted by the *Zoll-verein*, would compel the people of Germany to do the same, attended with similar results. The market of England would be borne down with the weight, and the price would fall so low as utterly to destroy the power of the labourer on land to pay rent for its use, and the power of the owner to improve it. The class intermediate between the producers in various parts of the world, would daily grow in numbers and strength, and the productiveness of labour and land would daily diminish, with steady diminution in the value of both.

On the other hand, let us suppose the people of the Union, of Russia, and of Germany, to adopt such measures as would enable them to consume on the land the whole of the food produced upon the land, and thus to put a stop to the enormous imports by which the English agriculturist is now being crushed. The immediate effect would be that the labour and land of all those countries would rise in value, and therewith there would be an increase in the value of both in England. The demand for labour here would speedily drain off the surplus hands employed in factory labour, and the increased demand for home-grown food would induce the application of labour and capital to production,\* and the value of both would rise. Consumption would increase as labour became more productive, and the power of the producers would be restored, while that of the mere exchangers would be diminished.

To the improvement of the condition of labour and land in the United Kingdom the abolition of the colonial system is essential. Its maintenance involves the payment of taxes to an amount that is terrific, *all of which must be paid by the producers and those who own the machine of production, abroad or at home.* The tax that is nominally paid by the man who sells the wheat, or by him who transports it, is really paid by the man who produces it, and by him that consumes it. Three-fourths of the nation are engaged in the work of transporting, converting, or exchanging the products of others, adding nothing whatever to the quantity produced, while living out of it, and thus deteriorating the condition of the land-owners and labourers of England and of the world.

The land-owners of England have been the legislators of England. They made the system which produced our revolution—that which has depopulated India, and must ruin every country subjected to it—and they are now paying the penalty. Each step towards the degradation of the people by whom they were surrounded has been attended by loss of power in themselves. Their policy has converted the little occupant into the hired labourer, and the labourers on land into the tenants of lanes and alleys in Liverpool and Manchester. Throughout much of Scotland they have substituted sheep for the men whom they have driven to take refuge in Glasgow, and with each such step they have weakened themselves, converting

---

\* At a recent meeting in London, Dr. Buckland asserted that the product of all the clay lands of England might be doubled by a moderate expenditure for drainage.

† The greatest crowding of population in a neighbourhood is in a district in Liverpool, England, containing a population of 8000 on 49,000 square yards of ground, being in the proportion of 657,963 to a square mile.

those who were their own support into the tools of those who live at the cost of both. The exchanger has set his foot upon their necks. *Commerce is King*. They are prostrate, and so they must remain until they shall have help from abroad. Their natural allies are the land-owners of the rest of the world. The East India Company, as the great land-owner of India, is greatly interested. That country is becoming daily less and less able to pay taxes, and the power so to do must diminish with the continuance of the system. Were the machinery now employed in converting cotton into cloth for India employed in making cloth in India, thus making a market on the land for its products, the culture of cotton would revive, the demand for food would increase, population would grow, and jungle would be cleared, and the Company might then obtain a constantly increasing rent from taxes constantly decreasing in their weight, paid by a people constantly improving in condition. The price of labour would rise, and the necessity for armies would diminish, and the Company might then, at no distant period, sell out its establishments to a people who would thereafter govern themselves.

It is to the people of the United States, however, that they must chiefly look for help. Owners already of the chief part of North America, they are likely soon to own the whole. The *national*, not party or sectional, adoption of the protective policy would at once raise the value of land throughout the Union, because it would then be felt that a market would everywhere be made on the land for the products of the land. The British provinces would then speedily be incorporated into the Union, and the supply of food to British markets would cease; Cuba and Mexico would follow, and thus would be made a market for the population of all Southern Europe; and with each such step the value of labour would rise, followed by a necessity, on the part of the landholders everywhere, for an effort to retain their rent-payers, if they would preserve the value of their land. Spain and Italy would become manufacturers for themselves, and thus the colonial system would gradually pass out, and with it the power of the exchangers over the labourers and land-owners.

It is not by immigration alone that the population of the Union would be augmented, and increased value given to the land which so much abounds. The present system degrades the country to build up great cities, to become the resort of tens of thousands who would have remained at home among parents and friends, had furnaces, rolling-mills, cotton or woollen mills afforded them employment for time and mind. The same cause compels another portion to fly to the West; and while, in the one case, we have the poverty, vice, and disease of crowded cities, in the other we have those of scattered population; and men, women, and children starve in New York, while other men, women, and children perish of fevers incident to the occupation of new countries in advance of the arrangements that would have resulted from the more gradual extension of the area of settlement. It will be said that here is discord. If the city population did not grow, what would become of the owners of city lots? The harmony of interests is here, as everywhere else, perfect. Towns and cities would grow more rapidly than ever, but they would grow more healthfully, preserving a nearer relation to the population of the country, whose trade they desired to perform. New York would cease to be, as now, a great wen, absorbing all the profits of hundreds of thousands of the poor farmers, her customers, who give ten days' labour employed in raising corn for the labour of one day employed in producing British iron. The country and the city would grow together, and the jealousy of the country towards the city would speedily pass away.

The people of China constitute a world of themselves. They have little



intercourse with the exterior world, nor is the example of Hindostan likely to produce any desire for its extension: certainly not, while they shall continue to recollect that their desire to prohibit the importation of opium involved them in a war that resulted in the destruction of cities and the ruin of hundreds of thousands of innocent people. The system of that country is directly the reverse of ours, in the fact that the government is in the hands of one, while here it is in the hands of all. In this, it labours under infinite disadvantage, yet the spectacle there presented of the results of combined action puts to shame our boasted civilization. A recent writer thus describes the condition of the people:—

“The farms are small, each consisting of from one to four or five acres, indeed, every cottager has his own little tea garden, the produce of which supplies the wants of his family, and the surplus brings him in a few dollars, which are spent on the other necessities of life. The same system is practised in every thing relating to Chinese agriculture. The cotton, silk, and rice farms, are generally all small, and managed upon the same plan. There are few sights more pleasing than a Chinese family in the interior engaged in gathering the tea-leaves, or, indeed, in any of their other agricultural pursuits. There is the old man, it may be the grandfather, or even the great-grandfather, patriarch-like directing his descendants, many of whom are in their youth and prime, while others are in their childhood, in the labours of the field. He stands in the midst of them, bowed down with age. But, to the honour of the Chinese as a nation, he is always looked up to by all with pride and affection, and his old age and gray hairs are honoured, revered and loved. When, after the labours of the day are over, they return to their humble and happy homes, their fare consists chiefly of rice, fish and vegetables, which they enjoy with great zest, and are happy and contented. I really believe there is no country in the world where the agricultural population are better off than they are in the north of China. Labour with them is pleasure, for its fruits are eaten by themselves, and the rod of the oppressor is unfelt and unknown.”\*

Let this be compared with the results of the system that has desolated Ireland and India, and that drives our people to Oregon and California, while men are everywhere, among ourselves, half-cultivating large farms, when they might obtain treble the result from half the surface, and let it then be determined which is the one that tends most to promote the prosperity and happiness of the labourer, and to improve the condition of the owner of land.

The policy of England tending to dispersion, she desires to facilitate the making of roads by which all the commodities of the world may be brought to her, thence to be returned to the places from whence they came, retaining so large a portion as to cause the destruction of the land and its owner. Lower India is utterly exhausted, and England desires railroads to more distant points, which will be then exhausted in their turn. From 1834 to 1840 she lent us iron to make roads in new countries, and we were ruined by dispersion. From 1843 to 1847, we filled up the spaces, the policy being that of concentration, and we grew rich. The present policy is that of dispersion. It is proposed to make a railroad to the Pacific, that men may scatter themselves more widely, although we now occupy a space that would be sufficient for almost the population of the world, if properly cultivated. The more roads we make in the now-settled States, the richer and stronger we shall grow, and the greater will be the value of land. The more roads we make in yet unsettled lands, the poorer and weaker we shall grow, and the less will be the value of land. It behoves the farmer, then, to look carefully to every scheme for promoting dispersion.

The value of labour and of capital is dependent on the quantity of both that can be given to the work of production. Every increase in the quan

---

\* Fortune's Wanderings in China.

tity of either required to be given to the work of conversion and transportation, tends to diminish the value of all. Every diminution in the quantity tends to increase the value of all. The nearer the consumer and the producer can be brought together, the greater is the quantity of capital and labour that can be given to the work of production, the smaller is that which is required for transportation, and the more rapid is the advance in the value of both labour and land.

We are now separating the consumer from the producer, and the consequence is, that five per cent. stocks are at par, land is cheap, and wages are low. Were the tariff of 1842 re-enacted, interest would rise to six per cent. and labour would command a large return—the consequence of which would be a great increase in the consumption of food, and wool, and cotton, and the value of land would rise.

The annexation of a million of people, emigrants from Europe, to our community, establishes free trade with them. The annexation of the land and the people of Canada, and the other British possessions, would enlarge the domain of perfect free trade. So would that of Cuba, Mexico, Ireland, or even England,\* and free trade thus established would be beneficial to all, the annexers and the annexed.

The people of the north would not object to the annexation of Canada, although such a measure could profit them but little. They and the Canadians are both sellers of food, and it is the superior value of wheat and flour on the south side of the line by which they are divided that induces the Canadians to desire to be brought within the Union. The people of the South would oppose the admission of Canada, although the effect of such a measure would be to convert the Canadians into large customers, instead of permitting them to remain small ones.† Once within the Union, the consumption of cotton in the British provinces would speedily rise from 20,000,000 of yards, weighing 5,000,000 of pounds, to 30,000,000 of pounds, and thus would the planter gain a market for 50,000 bales of cotton. The material interests of the South would be promoted by the annexation of Canada, yet would the South oppose the measure on the ground of supposed danger to political interests.

The South would advocate the admission of Cuba into the Union, although the effect of such a measure would, under existing circumstances, be that of ruining the cultivation of sugar, the only resource to which the planter now can look with hope—the only one that has enabled him to bear up under the late and present hopeless condition of the cotton culture. The man of the north would oppose the measure, although it would give him sugar at a cost far below the present one, and a market for grain and cloth that would absorb of both to a vast amount. Political interests are thus at variance with material ones. In both cases the discord is but apparent, while the harmony is real. The establishment of that real freedom of trade which results from the immigration of individuals, or from the annexation of communities, can never fail to be productive of benefit to all.

The cotton planter, as we have seen, now sells his product in the cheap—

\* Ireland and England are mentioned here only to show that the difficulty of having perfect free trade with them would be removed by the change in the value of labour that would result from change of their political system.

† Export to British North America in the first six months of

	1846.	1847.	1848.	1849.
Plain calicoes .	7,483,318	7,339,686	6,745,536	5,979,991
Printed " .	8,483,163	6,497,845	4,589,811	5,701,857
	16,966,481	13,837,531	11,335,347	11,681,848

est market and buys his cloth and iron in the dearest one. He gives away the one, and is then unable to buy the other. By changing his system, and compelling the loom to come to the cotton, and the anvil to come to the food, he will sell his cotton and obtain his cloth and iron in exchange for labour that is now being wasted. He will then export cloth to all the world, and the necessity for resorting to the cultivation of sugar will cease. The people of the North will then consume all the sugar that Cuba can produce, and those of Cuba will require pounds of cotton where now they consume but ounces.\*

## CHAPTER THIRTEENTH.

### HOW PROTECTION AFFECTS THE MANUFACTURER.

THE shipowner stands between the producer of cotton and his customers, and the larger proportion the quantity to be transported bears to the number of ships to do the work, the higher will be freights. We might thence suppose that his interest would be promoted by the pursuance of a course that would compel the cotton to go to the loom, and that he would be injured by the adoption of one requiring the loom to come to the cotton. Directly the reverse, however, as we have seen, is the fact. The more the loom can be made to come to the cotton, the more valuable are the services of men, the greater the number of men to be imported, the larger the number of commodities that can be exported, and the larger the business for ships.

The manufacturer, in like manner, stands between the producer and the consumer of cotton, and the larger the quantity of cotton to be converted compared with the machinery of conversion, the larger will be his charge for the use of his machinery. It might, therefore, be supposed that he would be injured by the adoption of measures tending to place the loom in the cotton-fields of the South, or on the coal-fields of the West, but the reverse is the fact. The more people make coarse cloth in the South and West, the more will there be to require fine cloth and silks from the East, and the greater the demand for labour in the one, the greater will be the requisitions made upon the other for the skill they have already acquired, with a constant increase of wages, and equally constant increase in the power of consuming food, cloth, and iron. The more they can make their exchanges at home, with men whose labour is valuable, the larger will be the equivalent received for their own labour; and the more rapid the increase in the value of that of others, the greater will be the value of their own. Every measure tending to break down the monopoly of machinery tends to increase the value of man throughout the world, and none could have that effect to such an extent as would the transfer of the machinery of Lowell to the cotton-fields, to be replaced by other machinery of a higher order.

But, it will be said, "The people of the South need no further protection than they now have. They are satisfied with 30 per cent., and why, if they can go on to manufacture without any increase of duty, should they impose higher duties on fine cloths and silks, for the benefit of the North and East? We know that the latter cannot make fine muslins at the present rate of duty—nor can they manufacture silk goods in competition with France. The South will work up its cotton and make its own exchanges, leaving the duty as it stands, and then Lowell, Lawrence, and Providence must go down, for competition is impossible." Such are the views perpetually promulgated by journals whose editors profess great acquaintance with political

---

\* The export from Great Britain to all the foreign West India Islands is but little over 20,000,000 of yards.



economy, and whose speculations are received as authority by their readers. Nothing, however, could be less in accordance with the true interests of the planters.

The larger the quantity of the machinery prepared for the conversion of cotton into cloth, the smaller will be the charge for its use. The planter requires to rid himself of a *monopoly* that limits the increase of that machinery, and compels him to give to the owners of the little that exists, whether English or American, a share of the product entirely disproportioned to its value as compared with that of the machinery required for producing his cotton. To break down one monopoly and establish another would not answer his purpose, and yet such would be the result at which he would arrive were he to pursue a course that would merely substitute Augusta for Lowell, or Graniteville for Lawrence. The man of the South would, and necessarily, do as he of the North now does, buy his cotton at the market price, *as fixed in England*, and sell his goods at the market price, *as fixed in England*, for until the quantity of machinery shall be so far increased as to prevent the accumulation of large stocks in England, the price must continue to be there fixed for the world; and so long as we shall continue to be *compelled* to go there for any portion of our supplies of cloth, the price of the whole will continue to be fixed by the cost of obtaining the last small portion. What the planter needs is that the price shall be fixed here, for both cotton and cloth, and that it may be so, he requires an *increase* of the quantity of machinery ready to do his work, and not the mere substitution of that of Southern men for that of Northern men.

How indispensably necessary it is that they should do so will be obvious from an examination of the diagram given at page 75. It is there shown how enormous are the charges of the manufacturers when the quantity for cotton requiring to be converted bears a large proportion to the machinery for converting it. In the following table are given,

First. The amount of the crop.

Second. The prices of cotton in Liverpool, by which those of the rest of the world are settled. The dates taken are March, 1844, July, 1845, May, 1846, and June, 1847.

Third. The price of best mule twist, No. 2 per pound, at the same periods of time.

Fourth. The price the whole crop, allowing twelve per cent. for waste, would yield, if converted into this description of yarn.

Fifth. The yield to the planter, supposing the whole crop so sold, from which are to be deducted all the freights, charges, &c., between his plantation and Liverpool.

Sixth. The amount retained by the manufacturer as his charge for converting cotton-wool into yarn.

Year.	Crop.	Price.	Price of twist.	Amount of twist.	Price of crop.	Charge for conversion.
1843-4	815,000,000	6d.	10 $\frac{1}{4}$ d.	£31,000,000	£20,000,000	£11,000,000
1844-5	958,000,000	4	11 $\frac{3}{4}$	41,000,000	16,000,000	25,000,000
1845-6	840,000,000	4 $\frac{3}{4}$	9 $\frac{3}{4}$	30,000,000	16,500,000	13,500,000
1846-7	711,000,000	7	10 $\frac{1}{2}$	27,500,000	20,700,000	6,800,000

If we deduct from the crop of 1846-7, the comparatively small sum required for the payment of freight, charges, &c., and from that of 1844-5, the large sum required for the same purposes, it will be seen how insignificant is the return to the planter for a large crop compared with what he receives for a small one.

In 1847, the manufacturer gave 7d. and sold at an advance of about fifty per cent.—*i. e.* he charged half as much for converting the wool into yarn

as he paid for the wool itself. In 1845, when he paid 4*d.* he sold at nearly a shilling—*i. e.*, he charged twice as much for the work of twisting the wool as he paid for the wool. He was enabled to do this, because of two reasons:—First, the machinery of conversion was disproportioned to the quantity of cotton to be converted; and second, the market for cotton goods was extending itself, because the world was comparatively peaceful, and labour was being applied more productively than usual. The effect of the change that has since occurred will be seen from the following view of the operations of 1848.

Crop.	Price.	Price of yarn.	Amount of yarn.	Amount of crop.	Charge for conversion.
1847-8 940,000,000	4 <i>d.</i>	8 <i>d.</i>	£28,000,000	£15,600,000	£12,400,000

The machinery had been increased, but the market was gone. Wars, revolutions, and threats of war and revolution, had destroyed it. The planter had 4*d.* per pound, of which a large portion was swallowed up in the cost of transportation; and the manufacturer obtained as much for twisting the wool into yarn as the planter received for raising, ginning and baling it, and for transporting it, first to the place of shipment, and thence to Liverpool, together with all the charges of the numerous persons through whose hands it passed on its way.

The planter needs machinery adequate to the conversion of his crop, and also a market for it when converted. The failure of either is equally fatal to him.

The first he cannot have under the monopoly system. It is one of mere gambling; and while a few make fortunes, the many are ruined. The distant few, already wealthy—the cotton-lords of England—are not the men to whom he must look to provide him with it. It is to himself, and the many like himself, at home. Fuel and iron ore abound in the South, and cotton fields furnish cheap sites for the erection of acres of factory, in which the product of thousands of acres of cotton could be converted by aid of the labour that is now wasted—the coal and the iron ore whose powers remain unused—the water powers that remain unimproved. By their aid, every pound of cotton now produced in the South, not required by Great Britain and others for their own immediate consumption, could be converted into yarn or cloth, and cheaply furnished to the world. The planter would then receive a yard of cloth for a pound and a half of cotton, instead of giving five pounds for one.

The difference between the price of the crop of cotton, in *Liverpool*, and the price of yarn, also in *Liverpool*, in 1844-5, would have exceeded a hundred millions of dollars, being twice the amount\* that it would cost to place in the cotton fields of the South spindles for converting into yarn the whole crop that is now sent without the limits of the Union.

He would then have yarn or cloth to sell instead of cotton, and then his crop would speedily rise to five millions of bales, for the labour and manure now wasted on the road would go upon the land. Capital now absorbed by brokers, ship-owners, and distant manufacturers, would be applied to the making of railroads, the improvement of the machinery of cultivation, the diffusion of knowledge, and in a thousand other ways tending to render labour more productive. Where, however, is he to find a market for his products, thus increased?

Commerce is but an exchange of equivalents; and if the supply of iron, silk, coffee, tea, and other commodities required by the planter, do not keep pace with increase in the supply of cotton, he will be constantly giving

\* See Plough, Loom, and Anvil, No. XIX., page 421.

more cotton for less iron or silk, and thus others will enjoy the whole advantage resulting from his increased exertion. That the advantage may, as justly it should, be his, it is necessary that the production of the commodities that he desires *to receive* in exchange go on to increase in a manner correspondent with that which he desires *to give*. If it does so, he gives labour for labour. If it does not, he gives more labour for less labour.

The question now arises: Can the production of the world, under the existing system, go on to increase in such a manner as to give to the planter a proper equivalent for his production? The answer is to be found in the fact, that it has already failed to do so, and that he is even now obliged to abandon cotton for wheat and sugar. How, then, can it be expected to do so in future? The average crop must speedily reach 3,000,000 of bales; and, when it shall have done so, his condition will be worse than at present. The production of the world does not increase correspondingly with our own; and until it can be made so to do, we must work at disadvantage, giving much labour for little labour.

With all its immense mass of rich and unimproved land, the United Kingdom produces little. It does not even feed itself. It has a little iron and coal to sell, but a demand for an extra hundred thousand tons of the former would greatly increase the price of the whole without producing any material increase in the demand for cotton; for the rich iron-master would be made richer, while the poor miner would remain as poor as now. Great Britain has scarcely any thing to sell but *services*—not products. To her we cannot look for a market.

Of the people of France, almost half a million of those most capable of working employ themselves in carrying muskets, and a large portion of the labour of the rest is employed in raising food for them and other non-producers, in making clothing for them to wear, and powder for them to burn. They have, therefore, few products to sell, and, like Great Britain, they have little to offer in exchange but services.

The people of Italy and India raise some silk, but the chief part of both are otherwise occupied than in labours of production; and so are they like to be, and they cannot increase their product to keep pace with ours. Germany maintains large armies, and produces little to sell. So it is with Spain and Portugal. Mexico has a little silver and cochineal: but the quantity does not grow, nor is it likely so to do. Look where we may, the power of production is not only small, but incapable of increase under existing circumstances, and unless a change can be effected, we cannot find markets for the products of our constantly increasing population. What is the remedy? It is to bring the people to the place where *alone* their labour can be made productive, and thus establish perfect free trade with them.

Fifty thousand English miners and furnace men distributed among the coal and iron-ore fields of Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Tennessee and Alabama, would produce 600,000 tons of bar iron, to be exchanged with the farmer for his wheat, and the planter for his cotton, and the latter would then obtain a ton of the one for a bale of the other, instead of giving two or three for one. He could then make roads to go to market, and the labour of his people would become valuable, and they would consume five times the cloth they now consume, and thus would be made a double market for his cotton.

The same number of Italians would raise quadruple the silk we now consume, and they would be large consumers of food and cotton. Were the market for silk once made here, we should in a little time raise as much as all the world beside, and consume almost all we raised.

The planter and the farmer *must* make a market on the land for the



products of the land, by bringing here the people they desire to employ in the production of the commodities they require to consume; or they *must* continue to give a continually increasing quantity of labour for a continually decreasing one. By adopting the first course, they would convert the consumers of one pound into consumers of twenty pounds, and the consumers of twenty pounds into consumers of forty pounds. By adopting the opposite policy—that now called free trade—they will convert consumers of twenty pounds into consumers of one.

Were it now known in Europe that such was the *fixed and unalterable policy of the nation*, the present year would see the transfer of population to the extent of half a million of persons, and of capital, in the form of machinery, to an incalculable extent; and once here, here they would stay, increasing at once, and immensely, the market for both food and cotton. Five years would scarcely elapse before it would reach a million; for with every year the power to obtain food, clothing, and the machinery for profitably applying labour, would increase, offering new inducements for the transfer of both labour and capital. With each year, the desire of our neighbours, north and south, to enter the Union would increase, and but few would elapse before it would embrace all North America, and a population of forty or fifty millions of people, themselves consuming far more than all the cotton we now raise. The Canadian, in the Union, would find his labours trebly profitable, for he would obtain treble the iron and cloth in return for less exertion. The mines of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick would give forth their treasures in return to the labour of men who now can consume but little food or clothing, but would then have power to consume much. The mines of Mexico would be made to yield three dollars where now they yield but one; and all would obtain silver, gold, iron, lead, cloth, and all other of the necessities, comforts, and luxuries of life, at diminished cost of labour.

With each step of this progress there would be increased demand for the labour, both physical and mental, of the manufacturers of the North, for the demand for fine cloths and for silk would grow with the growth of the power to produce coarse cloth and iron; the demand for fine books would grow with the increase of school-books and newspapers; and the demand for cotton and woollen machinery would grow with the increase in the power to obtain railroad iron.

Between the manufacturer and the planter there is, therefore, perfect harmony of interest. All are alike interested in the exertion to shake off the load imposed upon them by the present monopoly of machinery; but of all the agriculturist is most interested. Its tendency is to reduce the power of production throughout the world, to diminish the power of consumption, and thus to destroy the customers of both planter and farmer. The tendency of protection is to raise the value of labour throughout the world, by increasing the estimation in which man is held abroad, and thereby to augment production and the power of consumption. With every increase in the tendency to fly from Europe, it would be felt more necessary to endeavour to keep the people at home. By that process, and that alone, will the labourer of the world be raised to a level with our own.

## CHAPTER THIRTEENTH.

## HOW PROTECTION AFFECTS THE CAPITALIST.

IF protection be "a war upon labour and capital," it must tend, by lessening the productiveness of labour, to prevent its proper employment, and thus to diminish the power of accumulating wealth by the clearing, draining, and enclosing of lands, the building of houses, the construction of roads and bridges for facilitating transportation, and of machinery for converting the products of the earth into the form required to fit them for the use of man. If, on the contrary, it be really, as its name imports, protection to the labourer, then must it increase the power of accumulating wealth, to be used for increasing his productive power, and thus facilitating the accumulation of further wealth.

The great machine of production is the land. The more time and mind that can be given to its cultivation, the more rapid will be the increase of production, the larger will be the return to capital, and the more rapid the improvement in the condition of man.

The more time and mind that *must* be given to the preparation of machinery of transportation, the slower will be the increase of production, the smaller will be the return to capital, and the slower the improvement in the condition of man. The object of protection is that of bringing the consumer to take his place by the side of the producer; thus saving transportation, and facilitating the application of labour to production, while diminishing the number of persons among whom the produce is to be divided.

A furnace, capable of producing 5000 tons of iron per annum, may be put in motion at a cost of \$30,000. These 5000 tons would exchange in Ohio for 150,000 bushels of wheat, the produce of 12,500 acres of land that has cost \$40 dollars an acre, equal to \$500,000, for the labour employed in clearing and draining it, in making fences, building barns, houses and doing all other things necessary to fit it for production. Let us suppose the furnace, houses for the men, preparation of the mines, &c. to have cost \$100,000, and yet the capital employed is five to one, to obtain precisely the same return. This, however, is not all. The wheat weighs 4000 tons, and to transport this to New York and thence to Liverpool requires more capital in wagons and canal boats than would have been required to produce the iron at home; and far more capital employed in ships than would have done it; and thus we have a total of seven or eight, if not even ten times the capital that is needed, while the return is precisely the same—5000 tons of iron.

The capital invested in building the furnace, the houses, and in preparing the mines, would have been permanent, and it would have given value to every acre around, because it would have made a market on the land for the products of the land, whereas, the wagons, ships, and canal-boats disappear with time; and the land, constantly cropped, becomes exhausted, and is frequently abandoned by the owners, and thus is the whole wasted.

The farmer will say that he could have obtained no more iron on the spot for the produce of his land, that the iron-master paid him for his wheat and charged him for his iron according to the price in Liverpool, and that he profited as much by exchanging in the one place as in the other. This is too nearly true. So long as he is *compelled* to compete with the inferior labour of Europe, so long must he accept this as a consequence. So long as he is *dependent* on England for a market for a single million of bushels of wheat, she will fix the price of all that is produced; and so long as he is *dependent* on her for the last few thousand tons of iron, she will fix the price of all that

is consumed. He needs to bring the home consumption of food up to the production, and the home production of iron up to the consumption, and the price of both will then be fixed at home. A little capital will then yield much iron. Now, much capital is required to produce little iron.

It has been shown (page 74,) that the whole of the cotton, 311,000,000 of pounds, consumed by the people of Great Britain and Ireland in 1845 and 1846, would have been paid for by 6,250,000 pieces of plain cottons, and 210,000 tons of iron, delivered in Liverpool. By the time this cloth and iron reached the plantation they would have shrunk into 5,000,000 pieces of cloth (120,000,000 of yards) and 160,000 tons of iron; and perhaps into a still smaller compass, even supposing them imported duty free. To have produced this 120,000,000 yards of cloth in those *two years* would have required 20 mills of moderate size, each capable of converting into cloth 2000 bales of cotton, and to have produced this iron would have required little more than two establishments, such as the one described at page 42, as existing in the Lehigh region of Pennsylvania.

To transport the 700,000 bales of cotton must have required 60 ships, each carrying 2000 bales, and making three voyages a year. Add to these, steamboats, warehouses, packing-machinery, &c., on this side of the Atlantic, and the docks, drays, warehouses, cars, railroads, &c. on the other side, and it will be found that the capital required for the work of transporting these 311,000,000, *after they had reached the place of shipment*, was three times more than would have furnished machinery that would have enabled the planter to convert the whole of them on the spot. *For all this the planter pays*, and therefore it is that we find him to have sent away 311,000,000 of pounds of cotton, to be exchanged in Liverpool for 74,000,000 of pounds in the form of cloth, and then to be reduced to 60,000,000 by the time they arrive on the plantation, thus giving five pounds of cotton for one yard of cloth. It is obvious that, even thus far, much capital is required to obtain small product.

Let us now see what was the amount employed by the planter in producing, at the place of shipment, the 250,000,000 of pounds that he gave in those two years to the people of England, for twisting and weaving the 60,000,000 that came back in the form of cloth. The annual average is 155,000,000 sent out, and 30,000,000 returned, 125,000,000 being lost on the road. The average product of cotton land is under 300 pounds an acre, at which rate 416,000 acres would be required for the production of the 125,000,000, saying nothing of the remainder of the various plantations not under cultivation. The average amount of labour, per acre, required to fit these lands for production, including fencing, houses, machinery, gin-houses, roads, &c., has not been less than one hundred days, and I should be safe in putting it much higher. Estimating those days at only 50 cents each, we obtain \$50 as the actual expenditure required for each acre of land, at which rate the capital in land would be \$20,800,000. Estimating the hands employed at no more than the land, we have a further sum of \$20,800,000. Next, we have the capital employed in transportation to the place of shipment, and that some idea may be formed of that, I give the following statement, by one who furnishes it as the result of his personal observation:—

“Of the expense of this first movement, some idea may be formed by those who have seen it coming over dreadful roads, up to the hub, dragged slowly along 20, 30, or 40 miles, as we have seen it coming into Natchez and Vicksburg, hauled by five yoke of oxen carrying 2800 to 3000 pounds, and so slowly that motion was scarcely perceptible. So many perish in the yoke in winter and spring that it has been said, with some exaggeration, that you might walk on dead oxen from Jackson to Vicksburg. That was before the railroad was made. A wagon is loaded up, say 14 miles from Natchez, and



started at night, and reaches there in time to get back the next night time enough to "load up." Thus ten oxen have been wearing and tearing and dropping their manure on the road for 24 hours to make one load."\*

Here we have five yoke of oxen transporting 3000 pounds in a day, a distance of only fourteen miles. Supposing the average distance to be 75 miles, and the roads to be similar, it would take them, *on an average*, a week to transport that quantity from the plantation to the place of shipment. I will, however, suppose that a single yoke of oxen can transport four bales, or 1800 pounds, per week. The number of loads would be 70,000, to be transported in the shipping season, which averages about eight months. To do this would require, always on the road,

2300 wagons, average cost \$80,	.	.	.	.	\$175,000
4400 oxen, " " \$40,	.	.	.	.	175,000
2200 men, " " \$600,	.	.	.	.	1,320,000
					<hr/>
					1,670,000
					<hr/>
Total capital,	.	.	.	.	\$43,270,000

This is a very low estimate of the fixed labour, called capital, given to the production at the place of shipment of these 125,000,000 of pounds of cotton. Let us now see how much is the fixed capital, the use of which is given by the distant manufacturers in exchange for all this. A mill that will work up 2000 bales of cotton can readily be produced at a cost not exceeding \$100,000. These 2000 bales contain 900,000 pounds of cotton. Thirty-four such mills would work up 30,000,000 of pounds, and the cost of all these mills would be \$3,000,000, or about one-fifteenth of the capital employed by the planter. Need we wonder that the planter's capital yields him a small return?

The more directly power is applied, the more efficiently it is applied. The more machinery that intervenes, the less is the power and the smaller the effect. The planter obtains his cloth and iron by the indirect means of raising cotton and food to send abroad, whereas, if he would apply his power directly to the production of both, production would be doubled and his power of accumulation quadrupled. Had the planters of 1845 and '46, provided themselves with machinery for the conversion of cotton into cloth, to the extent of the 155,000,000 consumed in England, they would have seen furnaces rise among them capable of producing treble the iron they could have obtained for that cotton, and thus would have been made a market on the land for the products of the land, the result of which would have been that they would have obtained far more for the balance of their crop than they did obtain for the whole. The produce of those 155,000,000 would then have bought them iron sufficient to make many hundred miles of railroad, and thus, while diminishing their necessity for resorting to distant markets, they would have increased their power so to do, by increasing their capital. It will be said, however, that while the labour employed in producing the cotton is set down, there is no allowance for that required for its conversion into cloth. No such allowance is needed. The labour of men, women, and children, now absolutely wasted in *every county* of the South is more than would be required for five such mills, and the cotton that is lost for want of aid in harvest-time would twice over pay for it.

The whole of those 125,000,000 of pounds of cotton consumed by the people of Great Britain and Ireland was thus absolutely wasted, and therefore it was

\* Skinner's Journal of Agriculture, Vol. III., p. 483.

that the planter obtained one pound of cotton in exchange for five. Could the charges be saved that now intervene between the planter on one side, and the spinner and weaver on the other, he would obtain two pounds of cloth for three of cotton, and to accomplish this there is but one mode of proceeding, and that is *to persuade the machinery to come to the cotton*, and thus obviate the necessity for sending the cotton to the machinery. At present, we seem to be pursuing the same course that would be pursued by the man who should expend hundreds of thousands of days of labour in clearing and cultivating land for the production of wheat, and then wasting two-thirds of it on the road to and from the distant mill, for want of the application of three or four thousand days of labour to put up a mill on his own land. A grist-mill costing 5,000 days of labour will grind all the grain produced upon land that has cost 300,000, and perhaps 500,000, days of labour to place it in its existing condition; and yet the man above referred to, would waste on the road annually more days than would build such an one. So it is with our planters and farmers. We see in every little community that mills speedily rise for the conversion of grain into flour, and are satisfied with one-eighth toll; and so we see in every neighbourhood, where there are timber and a little water-power, saw-mills are got up for converting lumber into boards; and with each such operation, flour and boards are obtained at less cost of labour, and the farmer has to give less of wheat, and of timber, to have them converted into flour and boards. What would the wheat-grower say who should have to give five bushels for getting one back in flour\*—and what should the cotton-grower say to getting back one bale of cotton in the form of cloth? Let him reflect on this question, and then answer the following one: Why should not every community of somewhat larger size have in like manner its own place for converting cotton into cloth? Could that be done, the planter would obtain half the cloth yielded by his cotton.

The latter will at first view probably deny this. He will say: If I sell my cotton to go to Manchester, it will produce me five cents. If I sell it to the manufacturer on the ground, he will give me no more. If I buy English cloth, it will cost me ten. If I had a manufacturer on the ground, I should pay the same. Such must be the case so long as he shall find himself *compelled* to compete in the market of England with the poor Hindoo for the sale of his cotton, and compelled to purchase there, a part of his supply of cloth, for so long will the prices of both be fixed in Liverpool. With every step in the progress of emancipation, however, he would find himself a gainer. Let him look around and see how much of the labour of his neighbourhood and of his own plantation is wasted for want of the demand that would be produced by the vicinity of the factory; and then let him reflect upon the advantage to be derived from having, in that factory, a place of employment throughout the year, of the persons who might, in case of need, aid him in his picking, and thus save for him the labour that is now lost on cotton wasted in the field, or overtaken there by frost. Let him consider these things, and he will probably find that the loss in them alone is equal to the value of the labour required for the conversion of all the cotton of the neighbourhood into yarn. If they could be saved, and he could thus, with

---

\* "In some places in Virginia—in Rappahanock, for instance—the farmer does pay as much as one barrel to get four transported to Fredericksburgh, apparently not stopping to calculate at what price and what yield per acre that becomes a losing game, and apparently not reflecting, that while they pay 25 cents for transporting one dollar's worth of *wheat* they could transport the same weight, or fifteen dollars' worth of wool—or \$7 50 of cheese, or \$18 worth of live beef—at the same cost!"—*Ibid*.

the same labour, send yarn to market instead of cotton, he and his neighbours would be great gainers by the operation.

Having done this, let him look to the price at which he sells his corn, and see what would be the difference to him if he had a market on the ground in consequence of the conversion of some of his neighbours into mechanics, mill operatives, &c. Instead of remaining poor on the produce of little pieces of land, they would obtain good wages, and consume double their present quantity, while producing none. He would at once save much of the cost of transportation. He would sell food at home instead of having to buy it, with cost of commissions and transportation from his own neighbourhood added to it to increase its price, at Manchester or Lowell, and all would be great gainers by the operation.

Let him then look to his cleared land, and study what would be its value if all the manure yielded by his hay, and oats, and corn, and fodder, went back upon the land, instead of being wasted on the road, and if all of that yielded by his wheat and corn remained upon the ground instead of going to Lowell or Manchester, and see if he would not be a gainer by the operation.

Let him then look to his uncleared land, and calculate how much it would cost him to destroy the timber. Let him then calculate the value of the timber, if the factory were near him, and if the blacksmith and the shoemaker, the hatter, and the tanner, the bricklayer and the carpenter, needed houses; and if a town were growing up around the mill, and its inhabitants wanting pork and meal, and milk, and beef, and flour, and potatoes, and mutton, and see if he would not be a gainer by the operation.

Let him look to the quantity of land upon which this timber stands, and on which he is paying, or losing, interest. Let him then look to the quality of that land, and compare it with that which he now cultivates. Let him calculate how many bushels of potatoes it would yield, and compare their value, when consumed upon the ground, with that of the 300 pounds of cotton now yielded by an acre, and see if he would not be a gainer by the operation.

Let him add all these things together, and see if he would not save all the freights and commissions; even although he obtained no more for his cotton, and paid as much for his cloth. Let him see if he would not obtain the full value of his cotton, instead of, as now, obtaining but one-third of it.

The great cities and towns of the world are built up out of the spoils of the farmer and planter. Looking around in New York, or in Philadelphia, or Boston, it is not possible to avoid being struck with the number of persons who live by merely exchanging—passing from the producer to the consumer—producing nothing themselves. Wagons and wagoners, carts and cartmen, boats and boatmen, ships and sailors, are everywhere carrying about cotton, and wool, and corn, and wheat, and flour, as if for the pleasure of doing it. The man of Tennessee sends his cotton to Manchester to be twisted. His corn goes along with it, to feed the man who twists it. It leaves him worth twenty cents. By the time it is consumed by the Manchester spinner, it is worth, perhaps a dollar. The labourer buys it at that price. The manufacturer gives him a dollar to pay for it, and he charges it to the cloth at \$1 10. The corn and cotton become cloth, and the Tennessee man buys it back, paying *five bales for one!* He can sometimes send his corn, but he can never send his potatoes, and the reason why he cannot is, that they are of the class of commodities of which the earth yields so largely that they will not pay freight. The only things he can raise for market are those of which the earth yields little, and that will therefore pay



freight. He raises three hundred pounds of cotton, all of which goes to market, bringing him back but sixty fashioned into cloth; returning nothing to the land of what it drew out of the land, whereas, if he had consumers near him, he would raise almost as many bushels of potatoes, the manure for which would go upon the land to enrich it, and make himself rich. He could then afford to clear, and ditch, and drain, and cultivate the richest land, now covered with timber, or with water.

Why does he not do these things? Why does he not convert the unprofitable consumers, everywhere around him, into profitable ones? Why does he continue, year after year, to send his grain, or cotton, to the distant mill, instead of bringing, *once and for ever*, the mill to him? The reason may be found in the newspapers every day. Two years since, cotton manufacturers, wool manufacturers, and iron manufacturers were prosperous. Now they are all stopping work. Many are already ruined, and many more are likely so to be. Why is this? Does it arise out of any change in our own affairs? It does not. It arises out of changes abroad. Two years since, England made railroads, and consumption then was large. This year she does not make roads, and consumption is small. Two years since, we built factories and furnaces. This year, manufacturers and furnace-builders are ruined. All of them would be ruined, had they not a Tariff of protection, inadequate as is that of 1846, to give them that protection that is needed to secure them against such changes. Prosperous they would now be, had the tariff of 1842 remained unaltered; and the thousands employed in them would have remained profitable customers for the farmers, instead of being driven over the country to become the rivals of the farmer, increasing the quantity of provisions, of which there is already a redundancy.

The capital employed in the transport of cotton is more than would build mills to convert the whole crop into cloth. The mill is saved labour. The transportation is labour lost, never to be regained. The mills once built, the whole of that labour might be applied to the work of production, for

---

\* The following picture of some of these unprofitable consumers is from a letter to the correspondent of "The New York Herald:"—

"I travelled yesterday over a public road twenty miles, and stopped at nearly every house. They were occupied by what are called 'the poor white people.' I found fifty log-houses on my route. You pass through a forest and come to cleared land. You see on one side of the road a field of corn, say five to ten acres; off a few rods back from the road, amid this corn stands a log cabin, the smoke curling up in blue wreaths even in these hot days. There is a wicket gate opening from the road, through which you pass and follow a footpath until you reach the entrance of the cabin. There is a stone for a step, and you enter. The woman is spinning. She asks you to a seat, which is made of hickory, both uprights and the seat. There are two or three more like it. In the corner of the room is a bed; the fire-place is very large, and the chimney is built of mud outside the hut. There are some nails for hats and clothes. There is a rifle on wooden pins; a shelf, with a few articles upon it, consisting of a broken comb, a Bible printed by the American Bible Society, and a case-knife. In a corner is a barrel. Look into it, and you will find a half bushel of corn meal inside, and over it, on a string, is a piece of bacon. There is a cupboard in the corner; open that, and perhaps you will find a cup and saucer and a plate, and perhaps you won't. This a picture from the life. You ask for the family—'My man is pulling fodder.' 'How many children have you?' 'Six;' and by and by you will see the whole, half dozen flaxy-headed children peeping in through the crevices of the hut, for in the summer season, as there are no windows, the filling in between the logs is taken out for air. You wonder how people can live in such a one-room den. Yet they do live, and get on very well. They keep a cow sometimes, a few pigs to make ham and bacon, and they raise corn, wheat, and oats. The cabin is worth twenty dollars, if it was to be bought."

the lost labour of the hands upon the plantation, and of the "poor white people," everywhere throughout the South, is more than would be required for the work of conversion. Protection seeks to enable the planter to save this labour and accumulate capital.

It is said to be "a war upon labour and capital;" but it would here certainly seem to be, what its name denotes, protection to the producer of food and wool against a system which compels him to give the use of fifteen dollars of capital in exchange for the use of one. Its object is that of promoting concentration. That of the system falsely called free-trade is to promote dispersion. The last twelve months have witnessed the expulsion of many thousands of men, and many millions of capital to California, not one-tenth of which will ever return. One of the papers of the day states that

"Considerable excitement has been created here (New York) among those who have made shipments of merchandise to California, by the receipt of letters from commission houses in San Francisco, containing account of sales. It appears that the charges have, in several instances, used up entirely the proceeds of the sales. We hear it stated in dry-good circles, that one of our largest auction-houses sent out over two hundred thousand dollars' worth of dry-goods last winter, for which, up to this time, they have received no proceeds."

Hundreds of ships are now in the Pacific, doing nothing and earning nothing, when they might be carrying cotton, and we are now building other ships to replace them. The capital now invested in those ships and in California would have built mills for the conversion of half the cotton of the South, and furnaces for the production of as much iron as is produced in Great Britain. For all this waste of capital the farmer and planter pay, for the harmony of interests is so perfect that the losses of the ship-owner and manufacturer are invariably borne, in largest proportion, by them.\*

\* The following estimate of the quantity of labour and capital *lost by ourselves* and wasted in California, is from the New York Herald, and is not far from the truth:—

"It is estimated that about 500 vessels had, up to the 1st of November, arrived at San Francisco, from the United States and Europe, and that at least 100,000 people were, at that time, in California. The average cost of outfit for each person cannot be less than \$200, which makes an aggregate of \$20,000,000. It will cost an average of at least \$300 per annum for each to live. This amounts to \$30,000,000. This makes a total of \$50,000,000, for the bare outfit and provisions for one year. The 500 vessels which had arrived, at the latest date, and the 500 on the way, are worth, on an average, about \$10,000 each, which amounts to \$10,000,000. The time of each individual we estimate to be worth, on an average, \$200—total, \$20,000,000. Grand total of outfit, cost of living one year, cost of vessels engaged in the trade, and value of time one year, \$80,000,000. This is a moderate calculation, as the actual outlay and absorption of capital, up to this time, will probably amount to full \$100,000,000. As an offset to this we have thus far received about six millions of dollars (\$6,000,000) in gold dust, from California and the whole Pacific coast. It will be perceived that there is still an enormous balance against California, and that it will be a long time, at the rate already realized, before we shall receive even the sum expended, to say nothing about profits. It is our impression that most of those engaged in the trade would be satisfied with merely the cost of their shipments. Most of them have abandoned all idea of profits, and many of them will never realize a cent: the charges, such as freight, storage, &c., will eat up every mill of first cost. The only product of California, to pay for this immense amount of property, is gold. At present it has no other resource, and we know of none but its minerals. It is now a little more than twelve months since the emigration to California commenced, and there has never been known, in the history of the world, such a movement as has been presented in this. Independent of the hundreds of vessels which have departed from all parts of the world for California, we have nearly a dozen of the finest steamships in the world, regularly employed in carrying passengers and the mail between this port and San Francisco, via Chagres and Panama. Several large steamers are now on the way round, to take their place in the line from Panama to San Francisco, and in a short time we shall have two or three more on the line between this city and Chagres."

The landowners of the world are the great capitalists. The exchangers are the small ones, and yet they and their machinery absorb the chief part of the products of the land, which therefore yields but small return to the labour employed in its preparation for production. Almost everywhere throughout this country it is of small value, rarely exceeding the cost of fencing and buildings. That it may be otherwise, and that landowners may grow rich, it is required that they bring the loom to the cotton, and the anvil to the food, instead of sending the mass of cotton and food, year after year, in search of the loom and the anvil.

How rapidly their capital is capable of accumulating is a lesson that the mass of the farmers and planters of the Union have yet to learn. The first settlement of land involves a large amount of labour; but here, as in many other cases, it is the first step that is the most costly. The land cleared, the farm enclosed, the house built, and the road made, the cost of transportation still absorbs so large a portion of the product that the whole has little value. The making of a railroad doubles it, but the quantity of cloth or iron that can be obtained for wheat or cotton is yet so small that the land has still but little value. To bring the furnace or the cotton mill to the spot, and thus to make a market on the land for the products of the land, requires an amount of labour that is absolutely insignificant compared with the amount already expended, and yet it doubles the value of all around. The sole cause of the difference in the value of land anywhere—quality being equal—is to be found in the proximity to, or distance from, market.

Let us now suppose that during the last twenty years we had annually appropriated a small part of the labour that has been wasted on the road, and a small portion of the food and cotton that have been lost in distant markets, to the building of furnaces and the erection of cotton mills, and that the Southern States now possessed a hundred of the former, each capable of producing 5000 tons of iron, and rolling mills to convert it into bars, and the latter capable of converting into cloth 500,000 bales of cotton, and that the spare labour of their hands had been employed in grading roads upon which they had been for years laying the bars produced in their own furnaces and mills, and see what would be the result. Throughout the whole South there would have been a market at hand for a large portion of their products, while every part would be enjoying facilities for transporting its surplus food or cotton to distant markets at one-fifth of the present cost, and thus the land of every part would have been acquiring value, to an extent almost incalculable. The planting States have 400,000,000 of acres, and the addition of ten dollars an acre to the present value would amount to four thousand millions of dollars, while the cost of building furnaces, rolling-mills, and all other of the machinery necessary to have covered those States with roads, and filled them with machinery to enable them to convert into cloth as much cotton as would free them from all *dependence* on the movements of distant markets, making them independent, would not have been fifty millions, and yet, large as it may seem, the return would have been an augmentation of capital counting by thousands of millions.

An addition of one dollar an acre in the annual value, or rent, of a plantation, would add more than ten dollars an acre to its value. The farmer now sends his corn to market and brings back twenty cents, yet the consumer pays fifty. He brings back iron that costs him 300 bushels per ton, yet the producer of that iron obtains but 25. Had the iron and cotton manufactures been allowed to develop themselves throughout Virginia, Tennessee, Alabama, and other of the Southern States, 60 bushels of corn, or half a bale of cotton, would this day pay for a ton of iron, and if that were the case, what would now be the value of land? Would it not be greater



than at present by more than twenty dollars an acre? If so, would not that amount to eight thousand millions of dollars? It is almost inconceivable how trivial is the amount of capital required to double, treble, or quadruple the value of land, after the first and most expensive process, that of the first occupation, has been performed.

Let us now look to the state of things in England. The great field of employment for capital is the land. The number of acres in the United Kingdom is sixty-four millions. An expenditure of labour to the extent of only twenty shillings per acre would absorb the enormous sum of three hundred millions of dollars, and an average of three guineas per acre would absorb one thousand millions; whereas the whole capital employed in the cotton manufacture is but thirty-four millions of pounds,\* or about one hundred and sixty millions of dollars, and that invested in shipping is but little more. Now, if we suppose one-half of the cotton machinery to be for the domestic trade, and the other half for the foreign, and one-half of the navigation to be for home purposes, including the procuring of tea, coffee, sugar, silk, &c., for the home market—and the other half to be for other purposes, the result will be that the market for capital provided by the foreign trade is but one-sixth of what would be required for agriculture, at only three pounds per acre. If we take the average duration of ships and machinery to be ten years, we have an annual demand by the foreign trade for three millions only, being equal to less than one shilling per acre annually invested in the improvement of land. No one who is familiar with the condition of Irish agriculture, and of a large portion of that of England and Scotland, can doubt that the expenditure of twenty times that amount in the gradual improvement of cultivation, and in the improvement of communications would be attended with a large return. Land, however, is everywhere centralized in the hands of great owners, and cultivated by great farmers; and the consequence is, that capital does not find employment in its improvement, and has to seek a vent in manufactures and commerce, which, together, afford a field so small, that competition is great and the rate of profit is very low.

The savings of Ireland are forced into England, because of the absence of all modes of local investment. From 1821 to 1833, no less than ten millions of pounds were thus transferred; and later statements show that the course of events from that time to the present has been nearly the same.

Of the deposits in the Scottish banks, a large portion is habitually invested in the funds; and thus, local investment being prevented, there is a constant pressure upon the centre, which deprives the capitalists, great and small, of remuneration.

The natural consequence of this absence of facilities for applying capital at the places at which it is owned, is the accumulation of large quantities in London, for which a market is to be sought at low rates of interest. Foreigners are then invited to borrow money—that is to say, to buy cloth and iron on credit—and then when by this process the unemployed capital has been scattered to different parts of the earth, there comes a crisis, and the debts are called in, with bankruptcy to the debtors of England, and wide-spread ruin among the merchants of England. Such is the history of the period from 1835 to 1842, ending in bankruptcy and repudiation. Such is the history, so far, of the tariff of '46. We have bought from thirty to forty millions of dollars of goods on credit, and the day of payment must come.

By a succession of operations of this kind all the customers of England

---

\* McCulloch's Statistics, Vol. I. p. 78.

had been ruined, and there remained, in 1842, no foreign country that could be trusted. Capital appeared superabundant. Interest was very low, and there appeared no prospect of improvement. Every thing was prepared for a great home speculation, and the railroad soon became the hobby of the day. It was a great lottery, in which peers and paupers, bankers and half-pay officers, clergymen and pickpockets, bought tickets, all certain of drawing prizes. Five thousand miles of road have been made, at a nominal cost of £148,000,000,\* but the larger portion of this vast sum has been merely a transfer from the pocket of one gambler into that of another, as may be seen from the following statement. The mere Parliamentary expenses† of the Blackwall railway amounted to,

	per mile, \$70,000
Those of the Manchester and Birmingham to . . . . .	25,000
And those of the Eastern Counties' road to . . . . .	23,000
The amount allowed for land by the Manchester and Birmingham, was . . . . .	80,000
Eastern counties . . . . .	75,000

In this manner, the cost of the works executed was swelled to \$250,000, \$300,000, \$400,000, and in one case to \$1,400,000 per mile, the consequence of which has been that while the designing few have been enriched, the many have been ruined, and England is covered with the wrecks of this disastrous speculation, which owed its existence to the fact that the whole policy of the country tended to force capital into commerce and manufactures, which afford the smallest field for its employment, and to drive it from agriculture, the only one that affords a field constantly enlarging, and in which an almost unlimited amount of labour and capital might be employed at a constantly increasing rate of return.

The manner in which the system operates upon the moneyed capitalist here is now to be examined. In 1835, as we have seen, the natural outlets for capital were closed. We ceased to build mills, furnaces, or rolling-mills, and the building of ships and houses was diminished. The necessary consequence of this blocking up of capital was, that the price of dividend-paying stocks rose, and this produced a desire to create new stocks with the then idle capital. Roads and canals were commenced at the west and south-west, banks were created, and the capitalist was led to believe that he was to obtain ten or fifteen per cent. per annum for the use of the means that he thus placed under the control of strangers. The day of settlement, however, arrived. England claimed payment for the cloth and iron; but the means by which she might have been paid were scattered to the four winds of heaven, invested in unproductive roads, and in banks that were ruined by the failure of their debtors; and *thus were wasted as many millions as would have built furnaces to produce quadruple the iron we ever yet have used, and converted into cloth all of the cotton we then produced.* The mass of smaller capitalists were ruined, but the few were made rich.

We are now moving in the same direction. Money is said to be cheap; that is, there is much in bank at the credit of depositors, for which they are receiving no interest. The papers of the day informs us that Western city stocks and bonds are coming into demand; and here we have the beginning of a movement similar to that of 1836. In a little time it will be judged expedient to create banks at a distance, and then a little while and England will claim payment for the cloth and iron we are now buying on credit, and then will be re-enacted the scenes of 1842.

\* Herapath's Railway Journal, quoted in North British Review, August, 1849.

† The Parliamentary expenses of 1845, '6, and '7, were upwards of £10,000,000, or \$50,000,000.—*Ibid.*

If we desire to know who are the persons from whom is derived the power thus to derange the movements of the world, it is needed only to look at the prices of cotton and yarn between the periods of 1844 and 1848, as shown in a former chapter. The farmers and planters of the world first give away their products, then borrow a part of them in the forms of cloth and iron, and when ruined by the operation are denounced as bankrupts and swindlers.

The well-understood interests of the capitalists of all nations are in perfect harmony with each other. Whatever tends to diminish production in one, tends to diminish the return to capital in all. The British system is "a war upon the labour and capital of the world;" upon her own as well as that of other nations. Its effect is to keep the return to the capitalist at a very low point, and often to deprive him altogether of return, and all because it tends to compel the labourer to underwork the Hindoo and the Russian, and to sink him to their level. Therefore it is that labourers and capitalists of other nations are forced to resort to measures of protection. The immediate effect of the adoption of efficient and complete protection, as a national measure, would be the transfer to this country of an immense body of capital in the form of machinery, followed by a gradual rise in the rate of profit abroad, which would tend to attain a level with our own. *That* capital, once here, could not be reclaimed. Like the men we import, it would stay, and the effect that would follow necessarily from its transfer would be an increased import of men—of all, the most valuable species of capital, though now, in Europe, the most despised.

To attain perfect freedom of trade, we need to raise the labourers and capitalists of Europe to a level with our own. The colonial system tends to depress and destroy both.

## CHAPTER FIFTEENTH.

### HOW PROTECTION AFFECTS THE LABOURER.

WHENEVER there is in market a surplus of any commodity, whether that surplus be the effect of natural or artificial causes, the price of the whole tends to fall to that at which the last portion can be sold—and whenever there is a deficiency, the price of the whole tends to rise to that point at which the last portion that is needed can be obtained. Labour is a commodity, the owners of which seek to exchange with other persons, giving it in the form of sugar or cotton, and receiving it in the form of cloth and iron, and, being such, it is subject to the same laws as all other commodities. So long as there shall be a surplus of it anywhere, the price everywhere tends to fall to the lowest level. With the diminution of the surplus anywhere, the price everywhere will tend to rise to a level with the highest.

Mere labour, unaided by machinery, can effect little. The man who has no axe cannot fell a tree, nor can he who has no spade dig the earth. The man who has no reaping-hook must pull up the grain, and he who has no horse or cart must transport his load upon his back. Such is the condition of the people of India, and such, nearly, is that of the people of Ireland. Labour is consequently unproductive, and its price is low.

To render labour productive, men require machinery, which is of three kinds, to wit: First, Machinery of *production*, consisting of lands that are cleared, drained, and otherwise fitted for the work of cultivation. Second, Machinery of *conversion*, as saw-mills, which convert logs into planks and boards; grist-mills, which convert wheat into flour; cotton and woollen-mills, which convert wool into cloth; and furnaces, which convert lime, fuel, and ore into iron. Third, Machinery of *transportation*, by aid of which the



man who raises food is enabled to place it where he can exchange it with the one who makes cloth or iron.

The two latter descriptions make no addition to the quantity of food or wool that is to be consumed. The wheat or cotton that goes into the mill comes out flour or cloth. The barrel of flour that goes into the ship comes out a barrel of flour, neither more nor less, and it will feed no more people when it comes out than when it went in.

The bushel of wheat that is sown comes out of the earth six, eight, or ten bushels, and the bushel of potatoes comes out twenty or thirty bushels. They have been placed in the machine of production, while the others have been placed in the machines of conversion or transportation.

The more labour that can be applied to the machine of production, the larger will be the supply of food and wool, and the larger will be the quantity of both that will be deemed the equivalent of a day's labour.

The nearer the place of conversion can be brought to the place of production, the less will be the necessity for transportation, the more steady will be the demand for labour throughout the year, the larger will be the quantity that may be given to the work of production, the better will the labourer be fed and clothed, and the more rapid will be the accumulation of wealth in the form of machinery to be used in the further increase of production.

Wealth tends to grow more rapidly than population, because better soils are brought into cultivation; and it does grow more rapidly whenever people abandon swords and muskets and take to spades and ploughs. Every increase in the ratio of wealth to population is attended with an increase in the power of the labourer as compared with that of landed or other capital. We all see that when ships are more abundant than passengers, the price of passage is low—and that when, on the contrary, passengers are more abundant than ships, the price is high. When ploughs and horses are more plenty than ploughmen, the latter fix the wages, but when ploughmen are more abundant than ploughs, the owners of the latter determine the distribution of the product of labour. When wealth increases rapidly, new soils are brought into cultivation, and more ploughmen are wanted. The demand for ploughs produces a demand for more men to mine coal and smelt iron ore, and the iron-master becomes a competitor for the employment of the labourer, who obtains a larger proportion of the constantly increasing return to labour. He wants clothes in greater abundance, and the manufacturer becomes a competitor with the iron-master and the farmer for his services. His proportion is again increased, and he wants sugar, and tea, and coffee, and now the ship-master competes with the manufacturer, the iron-master and the farmer; and thus with the growth of population and wealth there is produced a constantly increasing demand for labour, and its increased productiveness, and the consequently increased facility of accumulating wealth are followed necessarily and certainly by an increase of the labourer's proportion. His wages rise, and the *proportion* of the capitalist falls, yet now the latter accumulates fortune more rapidly than ever, and thus his interest and that of the labourer are in perfect harmony with each other. If we desire evidence of this, it is shown in the constantly increasing amount of the rental of England, derived from the appropriation of a constantly decreasing proportion of the product of the land: and in the enormous amount of railroad tolls compared with those of the turnpike: yet the railroad transports the farmer's wheat to market, and brings back sugar and coffee, taking not one-fourth as large a *proportion* for doing the business as was claimed by the owner of the wagon and horses, and him of the turnpike. The labourer's product is increased, and the proportion that goes to the capitalist is decreased. The power of the first over the product of his labour has grown, while that of the latter has diminished.

Look where we may, throughout this country, we shall find that where machinery of transportation is most needed, the quantity of labour that can be given to production is least, and the return to labour—or wages of the labourer in food, clothing, and other of the necessities and comforts of life—is least: and that where transportation is least needed, the quantity of labour that can be given to production is greatest, and wages are highest: or in other words, that the nearer the consumer and the producer can be brought together the larger is the return to labour.

For forty years past the cultivation of cotton in India has been gradually receding from the lower lands towards the hills, producing a constantly increasing necessity for the means of transportation, and a constant diminution in the quantity of labour that could be applied to production. With each such step labour has been becoming more and more surplus, and the reward of labour has been steadily diminishing.

During a large portion of this period, such has been the case with Southern labour. It has been gradually receding from the lower lands of South Carolina and Georgia, producing a constant increase in the necessity for transportation, while the commodities to be transported would command in return a constantly decreasing measure of cloth, iron, and other of the necessities of life. This tendency has been in some degree arrested by the large consumption at home, and by the power of applying labour to the culture of sugar; but were we now to change our revenue system, establishing perfect freedom of trade, the home manufacture of cotton and the home production of sugar must cease, and cotton wool would then fall to three cents per pound, for the planter would then be reduced to that as the only thing he could cultivate for sale. Labour would become more and more surplus, with a constant diminution of the power of the labourer to obtain either cloth or iron.

So has it been, and so must it continue to be, with the sugar and coffee planters. Their products yield them a constantly diminishing quantity of either cloth or iron, with constantly increasing difficulty of obtaining clothing or machinery in exchange for labour.

In New England, wages—*i. e.* the power to obtain food, clothing, and iron in exchange for labour—are high, but they tend to rise with every increase in the productiveness of Southern and Western labour, and so will they continue to do as Southern and Western men become manufacturers, because the latter will then have more to offer in exchange for labour. With any diminution in the productiveness of labour South or West, the wages of New England must fall, because there will then be less to offer them in exchange.

In England, the power to obtain food, clothing, or iron, for labour, is small, and it tends to diminish with every increase in the proportion of the population dependent upon transportation, and every diminution in the proportion that applies itself to production, because with each such step there is a necessity for greater exertion to underwork and supplant the Hindoo, whose annual wages even now are but six dollars, out of which he finds himself in food and clothing. With every step downwards, labour is more and more becoming surplus, as is seen from the growing anxiety to expel population, at almost any present sacrifice. Why it is so we may now inquire.

The great object of England is commerce.

Commerce among men tends to produce equality of condition, moral and physical. Whether it shall tend to raise or to depress the standard of condition, must depend upon the character of those with whom it is necessary that it should be maintained. The man who is compelled to associate with the idle, the dissolute, and the drunken, is likely to sink to the level of his companions.

So is it with labour. The necessity for depending on commerce with men

among whom the standard is low, tends to sink the labourer to the level of the lowest. Place half a dozen men on an island, two of whom are industrious and raise food, leaving it to the others, less disposed to work, to provide meat, fish, clothing, and shelter, and the industrious will be *compelled* to exchange with the idle. Clothing and shelter are as necessary as bread, and those who play will therefore profit by the labours of those who work. The latter, finding such to be the result, will cease to work with spirit, and by degrees all the members of the little community will become equally idle. Here lies the error of *communism* and *socialism*. They seek to compel union, and to force men to exchange with each other, the necessary effect of which is to sink the whole body to the level of those who are at the bottom.

So, too, is it with nations. The industrious community that raises food and is *dependent* on the idle one that makes iron must give much of the one for little of the other. The peaceful community that raises cotton and is *dependent* on the warlike one that raises silk, must give much cotton for little silk. Dependence on others for articles of necessity thus makes a community of goods, and the sober and industrious must help to support the idle and the dissolute—nations as well as individuals.

So long as this state of dependence exists, the condition of each is determined by that of the other. If the idle become more idle, and the dissolute more dissolute, those who still continue to work must steadily give more labour for less labour, and their condition must deteriorate unless they adopt such measures as shall gradually diminish and finally terminate their dependence on such companions.

The policy of England has tended to produce *communism* among nations. She has rendered herself dependent upon other communities for supplies of the articles of prime necessity, food and clothing, obtaining her rice from the wretched Hindoo, her corn from the Russian serf, and her wool from the Australian convict, neglecting her own rich soils that wait but the application of labour to become productive.

The necessary consequence of this is a tendency downwards in the condition of her people, and as it is with those of England that those of this country are invited to compete, it may not be amiss to show what is the condition to which they are now reduced by competition with the low-priced labour of Russia and of India.

The *Spectator*, a free-trade journal, informs us\* that “the condition of the labouring classes engaged in agriculture, long an opprobrium to our advancement in civilization, has not improved; while wages exhibit a *universal tendency to decline beneath the lowest level of recent times*.”

The *Morning Chronicle* has recently given a series of letters from a correspondent specially deputed to inquire into the condition of the labouring classes in the agricultural counties, and by him we are informed that in Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire the average wages of the year will not exceed 9s = \$2.16 per week, while in Berks and Wiltshire they will not exceed 7s 6d = \$1.79, and with this it is to be borne in mind that “when a poor wretch is prevented for a day, or even half a day, from working, his wages are stopped for the time.” The wife sometimes works in the fields, and adds three shillings a week to the fund out of which these unfortunate people are to be subsisted, yet this gain is not without a drawback, as will be seen by those who may read the following account of the condition of the English agricultural labourer, in the middle of the nineteenth century, which, long as it is, will be found interesting :—

---

\* November 12, 1849.



"When a married woman goes to the fields to work, she must leave her children at home. In many cases they are too young to be left by themselves, when they are generally left in charge of a young girl hired for the purpose. The sum paid to this vicarious mother, who is generally herself a mere child, is from 8*d.* to 1*s.* per week, in addition to which she is fed and lodged in the house. This is nearly equivalent to an addition of two more members to the family. If, therefore, the mother works in the fields for weekly wages equal to the maintenance of three children for the week, it is, in the first place, in many cases, at the cost of having two additional mouths to feed. But this is far from being all the disadvantages attending out-door labour by the mother. One of the worst features attending the system is the cheerlessness with which it invests the poor man's house. On returning from work, instead of finding his house in order and a meal comfortably prepared for him, his wife accompanies him home, or perhaps arrives after him, when all has to be done in his presence which should have been done for his reception. The result is, that home is made distasteful to him, and he lies to the nearest ale-house, where he soon spends the balance of his wife's earnings for the week, and also those of his children, if any of them have been at work. A great deal is lost also through the unthrifty habits of his wife. Her expertness at out-door labour has been acquired at the expense of an adequate knowledge of her in-door duties. She is an indifferent cook—a bad housewife in every respect. She is also in numerous instances lamentably deficient in knowledge of the most ordinary needle-work. All that she wants in these respects she might acquire, if she stayed more at home and was less in the fields. In addition to this, her children would have the benefit of being brought up under her own eye, instead of being, as they are, utterly neglected and left to themselves; for the party left in charge of them—and it is not always that any one is so—is generally herself a child, having no control whatever over them. It is under these circumstances that the seeds of future vice are plentifully sown. On the whole, as regards the system of married women working in the fields, I cannot, when the children are young, but look on the balance as being on the side of disadvantage. In that case I think it would be decidedly better for the poor man, having reference only to his physical comforts, that his wife stayed at home. And this is the position of many a labouring man. In many cases when the family is large, some of the children are at work, adding their scanty wages of from 1*s.* 6*d.* to 2*s.* a week to the common fund. But I have known numerous cases of families of seven children, of which the eldest was not eight years old. Besides, when these are fit to work and earn wages of their own, his children soon become independent of him, and set up for themselves. This is in one way a relief to him, unless his family, while diminishing at one end, is increasing at the other. There can be no doubt but that a family is frequently aided by the earnings of the children, but in by far the greater number of cases the means of support are procured by the parents themselves. From what has been already said of the disadvantage to the whole family at which the wife bears her share in procuring them, it will be evident that the husband's earnings are, after all, the true test and standard of his own condition and that of those dependent upon him.

Moreover, in a very large proportion of cases, the wife remains at home, attending to duties more appropriate to her sex and position, in which case there is no other aid to be had, unless it be the trifling and fitful earnings of one or two of the children. We have seen that, in the counties in question, there are about 40,000 married couples, who, with their children, numbering about 120,000, depend exclusively upon agricultural labour for support. Of the 40,000 mothers, fully one-half stay at home, some being compelled to do so on account of the extreme youth of their children; and others, save when their families are somewhat advanced, preferring from calculation to do so, as being the best mode of turning their scanty means to good account. This may be taken as the case with half the married couples, who, with their families, will number about 100,000 individuals. So far, therefore, as these are concerned, the children, in about the same proportion of families, being too young to add any thing to the common stock, there is nothing else to adopt as the test of their condition and the standard of their comforts but the earnings of the husband. Let us inquire, therefore, into the condition of a family thus solely dependent upon such wages as the husband has, on the average, received during the past portion of the current year. I can best illustrate that condition by one of the numerous cases which came under my consideration in Wiltshire. The labourer in that case had had 8*s.* a week, but he was then only in receipt of 7*s.* He had seven children, the eldest of whom, a girl, was in her eighth year. Two of his children had been at a "dunce's school;" but they were not then attending it, simply because he could not afford the 4*d.* a week which had to be paid for their education. To ascertain how far he was really

incapable in this respect, I requested him to detail to me the economy of his household for a week, taking his earnings at 8s. The following is the substance of the conversation, discarding, for the reader's sake, the portions in which the names are given.

When are your wages paid?—On Saturday night, but often only once a fortnight.

What do you do with the money on receiving it?—I first lay by my rent, which is a shilling a week. I then go to the grocer's and lay in something for Sunday and the rest of the week. I buy a little tea, of which I get two ounces for 6d. Sugar is cheap, but I cannot afford it. We sometimes sweeten the tea with a little treacle, but generally drink it unsweetened.

Do you purchase any butcher meat?—Generally for a Sunday we buy a bit of bacon.

How much?—It is seldom that I can afford more than half a pound.

Half a pound among nine of you?—Yes; it is but a mere taste, but we have not even that the rest of the week. It costs me about 5d.

Do you buy your bread, or make it at home?—We buy it. We have not fire enough to make it at home, or it would be a great saving to us.

Do you buy a quantity at once, or a loaf when you need it?—We buy it as we need it.

Have you a garden attached to your cottage?—I have about fifteen poles, for which I pay 1½d. a pole. It is less than the eighth of an acre.

What do you raise from it?—We raise some potatoes and cabbages.

Do you raise a sufficient quantity of potatoes to serve you for the year?—No, not even if they were all sound.

In addition to the potatoes and the cabbages which you raise, how much bread do you require for your own support, and that of your wife and seven children for the week?—We require seven gallons of bread at least.

What is a gallon of bread?—It is a loaf which used to weigh 8 lbs. 11 oz., but which now seldom weighs above 8 lbs. Those who supply bread to the union seldom make it over 8 lbs.

What is the price of the gallon loaf?—Tenpence. It is cheaper than it was, but then there is not always so much of it. It is often of short weight.

Seven gallons of bread at 10d. a gallon would make 5s. 10d., would it not?—I believe it would make about that—you ought to know.

Do you always get seven gallons a week?—No, seldom more than six.

Then you spend 5s. in bread, and make up for the want of more by potatoes and cabbages?—Yes.

You have still some money left; what do you do with it?—It costs us something for washing. For soap and soda, and for needles and thread for mending, we pay about 5d. a week.

Do you buy fuel?—We get a cwt. of coal sometimes, which would cost us about 1s. or 1s. 1½d. if we took in any quantity and paid ready money. When we do neither it costs us about 1s. 4d. a cwt. If there is one poor man who can afford to buy it in any quantity for ready money, there are forty who cannot.

How long would a cwt. of coals serve you?—We make it last one way or another for two weeks.

Your fuel, therefore, will cost you about 8d. a week?—It will.

Is there any thing else you have?—We buy a little salt butter sometimes, which we can get from 6½d. to 10d. a pound. We are obliged, of course, to take the cheapest; "and really, sir, it is sometimes not hardly fit to grease a wagon with."

But your money is already all gone: how do you pay for your butter?—It is not always that we have it, and we can only have it by stinting ourselves in other things.

You have said nothing about your clothing: how do you procure that?—But for the high wages we get during the harvest time, we could not get it at all.

How long does the time last when you get high wages?—About ten weeks, and but for what we then get I do not know how we could get on at all.

From this recapitulation it must certainly appear a mystery to the reader how they get on as it is. The weekly expenditure, in our view, is as follows, the family being nine, and the weekly receipts 8s. :—

	s.	d.
Rent . . . . .	1	0
Tea . . . . .	0	6
Bacon . . . . .	0	5
Bread . . . . .	5	0
Soda, soap, &c. . . . .	0	5
Fuel . . . . .	0	8
<b>Total . . . . .</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>

The provision for clothing is in the extra wages paid at harvest time, while the family cannot be treated to the luxury of bad butter without sacrificing the tea, two ounces of which must serve for a week, the half pound of bacon, which affords but a "mere taste" on Sunday to each; some of the bread which is already but too scantily supplied; or a portion of their fuel, the absence of which renders their home still more cheerless and desolate. Sugar, too, is out of the question, without trenching upon items more absolutely necessary. Nor is there any reserved fund for medicines, too often required by a family of nine thus miserably circumstanced. What, in short, have we here? We have nine people subsisting for seven days upon 60 lbs. of bread—scarcely a pound a day for each, half a pound of bacon, and two ounces of tea, the rest being made up by a provision, too scanty in nine cases out of ten, of potatoes and cabbages raised in the garden. Could they descend much lower in the scale of wretchedness, especially when we couple with their stinted supply of the less nutritious kinds of food the miserable hovels in which it is taken by them, either shivering in the winter's frosts, or inhaling the pestilential odours engendered around them by the summer heats?

I could no longer express any surprise at 4*d.* a week being grudged for the education of two children.

This being the mode in which his weekly wages were expended, I asked the same individual to give me an account of his daily life, including his labour and fare. In reply to my questions on this point he answered, in substance, as follows:—

At what hour do you go to work?—At six in the morning, generally, in summer; but I have gone much earlier. In winter time work begins at a later hour.

Do you breakfast at home?—When I do not go out very early I generally do.

Of what does your breakfast consist?—Principally of bread, and sometimes a little tea. Sometimes, too, we have a few potatoes boiled.

When do you dine?—About twelve.

Of what does your dinner consist?—On the Monday my wife gets a little flour and makes a pudding, which, with a few potatoes, forms my dinner. Sometimes we have a pudding on other days, but generally our dinner is bread and potatoes, with now and then a little cabbage. When the family is not large, there may be a bit of bacon left that has not been used on Sunday, but that is never the case with us.

You return to work again?—I do, and when I come home at night may have a little tea again, with the bread which forms my supper. The tea is never strong with us, but at night it is very weak.

Do your children get tea?—We have not enough for that.

What is their drink?—Water; sometimes we get them a little milk.

What is your own drink?—Water.

Do you never drink beer?—Never, but when it is given me; I can't afford to buy it.

When your dinner consists of bread, potatoes, and water, have you nothing to season it or make it palatable?—Nothing but a little salt butter; and we can only afford that when the bread or potatoes happen not to be very good, or when we are ailing, and our stomachs are a little dainty.

When your bread or potatoes are bad, or your stomachs are dainty, you take as a relish the butter which you said was scarcely fit to grease a wagon with?—We have nothing better to take.

Suppose you had nothing but bread to eat, how much would you require to sustain you at work in the course of a day?—Two pounds at least.

And how much would one of your children require?—About the same. A child, although not at work, will eat as much as a man; children are always growing, and always ready to eat, and one does not like to refuse food to them when they want it. I would sooner go without myself than stint my children, if I could help it.

Then, at the rate of two pounds a day for each, you would require for all about 126 lbs. for the week?—I suppose about that.

And, as you only get about sixty pounds of bread a week, you have to rely on your potatoes and cabbages, your half pound of bacon, and two ounces of tea, to make up for the sixty-six pounds which you cannot get?—We have nothing else to rely on.

Have you enough of these to afford you as much nourishment as there would be in sixty-six pounds of bread?—Not nearly enough.

Is what you have stated your manner of living from week to week?—It is when I have work.

And when you have not work, how is it with you?—In the winter months we have sometimes scarcely a bit to put in our mouths.



Such is the substance of the statement, as regards his own and his family's circumstances, made to me by a labouring man in the receipt of the average rate of wages for the last nine months in Wiltshire. Comment is scarcely needed, the facts speaking but too plainly for themselves. Had the family been smaller, or the wages a little higher, instead of a "taste," they might have had a meal of bacon once a week. But even then it would be but once a week, potatoes and bread still constituting the staple of their diet, and even these not being had by them in sufficient quantity. Besides, even if they had it more frequently, bacon is not the most nourishing food in the shape of butcher meat; it is fat, and goes to fat. The little lean that is in it is almost destroyed by the process of curing. But it is greasy, and soon satisfies. "It fills us sooner than any other kind of meat," was the reply given to me when I asked why they preferred it to beef? But the fault is that it does not fill them; it satiates, without filling them. Bulk is required as well as nutriment in food. The stomach has a mechanical as well as a chemical action to perform. A man could not live on cheese, nor could he exist on pills having in them the concentrated essence of beef. They buy bacon because it goes a longer way than other meat—in truth, they buy it because it soon cloyes them. Nor is it always that they have even a "taste" of it once a week. I have seen several families who had not tasted butcher meat of any kind for weeks at a time. When French and English workmen came together during the construction of some of the French railways, it was found that the Englishman could perform far more work than his French competitor. This was universally attributed to the superiority of his diet, it being supposed but reasonable on all hands to expect more work from the man who fed on beef and porter than from him whose fare was bread and grapes. But the fare of the man who is expected by his labour to develope, year after year, the agricultural wealth of England, is, in a large proportion of cases, little better than bread and water—the fare of the condemned cell! Contrast the condition of the English farm labourer with that of the farm labourer in Canada. In England he eats butcher-meat once a week, and not always that; in Canada he has as much of it as he wants once, at least, and frequently twice a day. Contrast his condition even with that of the slave in the Southern States of America. In Virginia, the great slave State, it is seldom that a day passes without the slave eating butcher-meat of some kind or other. In addition to this, when he is old and infirm, he has a claim on his master for support. But the English labourer, if he has a family to sustain, has not, even during the days of his strength, when he can do, and does work, the same nutritious diet as the slave; while, when he is disabled, or loses his work, he must starve, or, as the alternative, become a vagrant, or the recipient of a formal and organized charity. In the words of one of themselves, "it is not a living, sir—it is a mere being we get;" by which he intended to convey that their reward for their toil was their being barely enabled to exist.

It may be said that the case put is an extreme one. It is the case, however, of nearly one-half of those who are dependent upon labour in the fields. But it may be said that I have omitted to take into account some little privileges which the labourer has, and which, when he avails himself of them, tend to enhance his comforts. He may keep a pig, for instance, and his employer will sometimes find him straw for it, which, in process of time, will serve as manure for his little garden. This looks very well on paper, but that is chiefly all. In the four counties under consideration the number of labourers keeping pigs is about one in twelve. It is also a striking illustration of the condition of the labourers, that even such of them as do feed a pig seldom participate in the eating of it. Then we hear a great deal about the coal and clothing clubs, to which I shall hereafter more particularly advert, and the chief merit of which is that they tend to render life not pleasant, but barely tolerable to the poor."

The sleeping accommodations are thus described:—

"These are above, and are gained by means of a few greasy and rickety steps, which lead through a species of hatchway in the ceiling. Yes, there is but one room, and yet we counted nine in the family! And such a room! The small window in the roof admits just light enough to enable you to discern its character and dimensions. The rafters, which are all exposed, spring from the very floor, so that it is only in the very centre of the apartment that you have any chance of standing erect. The thatch oozes through the wood-work which supports it, the whole being begrimed with smoke and dust, and replete with vermin. There are no cobwebs, for the spider only spreads his net where flies are likely to be caught. You look in vain for a bedstead; there is none in the room. But there are their beds, lying side by side on the floor, almost in contact

with each other, and occupying nearly the whole length of the apartment. The beds are large sacks, filled with the chaff of oats, which the labourer sometimes gets and at others purchases from his employer. The chaff of wheat and barley is used on the farm for other purposes. The bed next the hatchway is that of the father and mother, with whom sleeps the infant, born but a few months ago in this very room. In the other beds sleep the children, the boys and girls together. The eldest girl is in her twelfth year, the eldest boy having nearly completed his eleventh; and they are likely to remain for years yet in the circumstances in which we now find them. With the exception of the youngest children, the family retire to rest about the same hour, generally undressing below, and then ascending and crawling over each other to their respective resting-places for the night. There are two blankets on the bed occupied by the parents, the others being covered with a very heterogeneous assemblage of materials. It not unfrequently happens that the clothes worn by the parents in the day time form the chief part of the covering of the children by night. Such is the dormitory in which, lying side by side, the nine whom we have just left below at their wretched meal will pass the night. The sole ventilation is through the small aperture occupied by what is termed, by courtesy, a window. In other words, there is scarcely any ventilation at all. What a den in the hour of sickness or death! What a den, indeed, at any time! And yet when the sable goddess stretches forth her leaden sceptre over the soft downy couch in Mayfair, such are the circumstances in which, in our rural parishes, she leaves a portion of her slumbering domain.

Let it not be said that this picture is overdrawn, or that it is a concentration, for effect, into one point, of effects spread in reality over a large surface. As a type of the extreme of domiciliary wretchedness in the rural districts, it is underdrawn. The cottage in question has two rooms. Some have only one, with as great a number of inmates to occupy it. Some of them, again, have three or four rooms, with a family occupying each room; the families so circumstanced amounting each, in some cases, to nine or ten individuals. In some cottages, too, a lodger is accommodated, who occupies the same apartment as the family. Such, fortunately, is not the condition of all the labourers in the agricultural districts; but it is the condition of a very great number of Englishmen—not in the backwoods of a remote settlement, but in the heart of Anglo-Saxon civilization, in the year of grace 1849."

Bad, however, as is all this, it is likely to be worse. Everywhere, notices are being given of a reduction of wages, and diminution in the number of persons to be employed. There is scarcely, says the writer, a district in any of these counties "where the work of reducing wages has not already commenced." In one of them, as early as last June, there was a reduction from 8s. to 7s., and "apprehensions are everywhere entertained that they will be reduced to 6s. = \$1.44." "Is it any wonder," he adds, "that, with such a prospect before them, the agricultural labourers should brood over their circumstances with the ominous sullenness of despair? What is that prospect? The winter is approaching—the season when most is required by us all to administer to our comforts. They are entering upon that season with here 8s., there 6s., and there again but 5s. a week for the support of their families. How far will these pitiful portions go in households of five, six, seven, eight, nine, or ten individuals? We cannot, in estimating a labourer's comforts at any given time, apply to them the test of his average wages. It is his wages for the time being that decide the measure of his condition. Had he at any time more than was necessary to carry him and his family up to the line of comfort, he might lay by the surplus for adverse times. But he never has what secures him perfect comfort, and is always more than tempted to spend all he gets. He therefore commences this winter, as he does every winter, without any reserve-fund to fall back upon; and the fact is appalling that, in this month of October, thousands of families in the very heart of England have no better prospect before them than that of living on 8s., 6s., and even 5s. a week, in their cold, damp, cheerless, and unhealthy homes."

The Canadian farmer is invited to contend in the market of England with the serf of Russia for the privilege of supplying with food men to whom a

morsel of bacon on a Sunday is a luxury, when by the simple process of annexation and protection he could bring to his side the same men and convert them into large and valuable customers. The planter is invited to contend in the market of England for the privilege of clothing men who want means to buy bread, when by an exercise of his will he could bring to his side, annually, millions of the same men, each of whom would then require twenty pounds a year, two millions consuming half as much as was consumed in 1847 by almost thirty millions of the people of England and Wales.

The system of England demands that with such people as these we shall establish a community of goods. Were it allowed free play—were the people of the world to establish what is called free trade, and thus unite their efforts for the maintenance of the *monopoly system*, wages universally would fall to the level of those of the poorest countries of the world, for with every step those of England would, of necessity, fall, because they must be kept at that point which would enable her people to underwork the world, and the tendency everywhere would be, as it has been in Ireland and India, downward. The adoption of perfect free trade by this country would, for a short time, produce some activity there, but a very short period would prove that we bought far less under free trade than we had done with protection, and in the mean time the disproportion of the English population would have largely increased, and the difficulty would be then far greater than it is now, great even as it is. We now *pay for* far less merchandise than we did three years since, and were it not that we are still able to buy on credit, we should make smaller demands on England than we have done at any period since 1842. The greater the amount of capital thus lent to us, the lower must fall the condition of the English labourer. Every step now being made by England is a step downwards, and if we would not have our labourers reduced to a level with hers we must, by protection, endeavour to raise hers to a level with ours, as it will do by relieving us from the necessity for *dependence* upon commerce with a people whose labour is lower in the scale than our own. It tends to raise the value of man abroad and at home, and to enable all to obtain *more* food, fuel, and clothing with *less* labour. Under it immigration has always increased, and it has declined with its diminution. That it must tend to raise wages abroad is obvious from the fact that so many hundreds of thousands of the population of Europe, held to be surplus, have sought our shores, thus diminishing the quantity of labour seeking there to be employed.

With the approach to what is called freedom of trade, that system which tends to the maintenance of the monopoly of machinery in England, the value of labour here is falling towards the level of that of England. The present diminished production of coal and iron is maintained only by aid of a great diminution of wages. Labour is becoming surplus, and immigration is already falling off. This year will show a large diminution therein, and every step in that direction must be attended with a rise of freights tending to diminish the power to export either food or cotton. With the diminution of wages at the North, there is already a diminished power to consume either food or clothing, with increase in the surplus that is to be sent. Thus the same measures that increase the *necessity* for depending on machinery of transportation diminish the *power* to obtain it, to the deterioration of the condition of the whole body of the people, labourers and capitalists, farmers and planters, manufacturers and ship-owners; and the same which tend to diminish our necessities for depending thereon, tend to increase our power to obtain it, to diminish the burden now pressing upon the land-owners and labourers of Europe, and to bring about that state of things which shall give to us and them perfect freedom of trade. The harmony of all interests, whether individual or national, becomes more and more obvious the more the subject is examined.



It may not be uninteresting to review the last few years, with special reference to the discords that have occasionally been seen to exist between the employers and the employed, accompanied by strikes, combinations, &c., with a view to show their cause.

It is within the recollection of most of my readers that the years from 1836 to 1839 were distinguished for disturbances of this kind. The cause is obvious. Production was diminishing, and the labourer found himself unable to obtain the quantity of food, fuel, and clothing to which he had been accustomed. He desired a rise of money-wages to meet the rise in the price of food, but the employer could not give it, and hence arose combinations for the purpose of compelling him to do so.

From 1844 to 1848, harmony was restored, because production increased, and the labourer found that each year enabled him to obtain more food and clothing, and better shelter, with the same labour.

The last year has been marked by a succession of combinations. In the coal region of Pennsylvania, at Pittsburgh, Lowell, and various other places, there have been strikes and turn-outs, some of them long-continued; and everywhere there have been clamours for the passage of laws restricting the hours of labour; but those who thus clamoured desired that wages should remain as they were. These things all result from the one great fact that the productiveness of labour is diminishing, and that wages are tending towards the European level.

To that cause was due the jealousy of foreigners which gave rise to the "native" party. In 1842, employment was almost unattainable, and the native workmen were indisposed to divide with strangers the little that was to be had. With the increased productiveness of labour wages rose, and the "native" party almost died out, while the import of foreigners was quadrupled. If the system of 1846 be continued, the same jealousy will re-appear, and foreigners will be proscribed, while immigration will be diminished.

It is to the interest of the native workmen that the wages of Europe should be brought up to a level with our own, and the only way in which that can be accomplished is for us to pursue a course that shall tend to render it the interest of every man in Europe that can find means to pay his passage to endeavour to reach our shores. Every one that comes will be a producer of something, and every one therefore a customer to others for their products. Look where we may, there is the most perfect harmony of interest.

## CHAPTER SIXTEENTH.

### HOW PROTECTION AFFECTS THE SLAVE AND HIS MASTER.

PROTECTION tends to increase the productiveness of labour. Many of the labourers of the Union are held as slaves, and protection must tend to render their labour more valuable to their owners, who may, therefore, be rendered less disposed to part with them. If such were likely to be the fact, protection would tend to perpetuate slavery, and all who were opposed to its continuance should advocate free trade.

By all English writers, and by many among ourselves, it is held that the way to terminate the existence of slavery is to destroy the value of slave-labour. With that view the British government is urged to prohibit slave-grown sugar, and to encourage the extension of the cotton culture in India—the wretched Hindoo, who labours a whole month for two rupees, (one dollar,) out of which he feeds and clothes himself, being held to be a freer man than the well-fed, well-clothed, and well-lodged labourer of Virginia or Kentucky.

Throughout the world, men have become free as wealth and population

have grown, and as land has increased in value. In the early days of Rome, when Latium was filled with prosperous cities, land was valuable, and men were free. With the gradual depopulation of Italy, land lost its value, and large masses accumulated in the hands of great proprietors surrounded by slaves. So was it in Attica. In the days of Solon, land was valuable and men were free. In those of Herodes Atticus, land was valueless and men were slaves. The richest lands of India have been abandoned and are now jungle, and the descendants of the little village proprietors of the last century now sell themselves to slavery in Jamaica and Demerara. In Russia, land has no value. The value of a property is estimated by the number of its serfs. In Belgium, land has great value, and the people are the freest in Europe. With the gradual increase in the value of land in England, men became more free, whereas with every step tending to increase dependence on Poland and Russia for food, land is becoming less valuable, labourers are becoming more and more the inhabitants of parish work-houses and the slaves of parish beadles, and landowners are becoming more and more anxious to expel the population that would otherwise give value to the land. The land of Ireland has almost lost its value, and the labourer of Ireland has become a slave to the caprices of masters who regard him as an encumbrance to be gotten rid of by any process, however cruel.

Increase in the value of land tends towards freedom; decrease tends towards slavery. If protection tends to add value to land, it tends to the promotion of freedom; if it tends to diminish its value, it tends to the maintenance of slavery.

The least valuable land is that in which men are most rare; the most valuable is that in which they most abound. The cause of the difference between the two is to be found in the difference in the labour required for the performance of exchanges. The hills of Limburg, the poorest part of Belgium, rent for from six to eight dollars; and for flax land in Flanders, ten to twelve dollars per acre is a common rent; while cotton-producing land of the highest quality may here be had, *in fee*, for *one-eighth* of the latter sum. The one has a market on the land, and the other has not; and in this single and simple fact may be found nearly the whole reason for this enormous disproportion.

The man who lives in Arkansas has to employ numerous men, horses, steamboats, ships, and warehouses, in the performance of every exchange, and the consequence is, that he receives for the produce of his land little more than compensation for his labour, and his land has scarcely any value. He can raise for market little else than cotton, of which the earth yields but little, for which reason it commands a price that will enable it to bear transportation. His surplus corn is almost valueless; while to attempt to raise for market potatoes or turnips, of which the earth yields by hundreds of bushels to the acre, would be ruinous.

The man who lives near New York exchanges directly with the consumer of his products and the producers of the commodities that he desires to consume. He can raise potatoes, turnips, and cabbages, bulky articles; or strawberries and raspberries, delicate ones—none of which will bear transportation. He sells his milk, and is not compelled to convert it into butter or cheese. He is not required to convert his corn into pork, with a view to diminishing its bulk and enabling it to go to market. His products are all consumed near him, and he can readily return to the land the refuse, increasing its productive power from year to year. The amount yielded is far more than wages for his labour, and the whole surplus is the rent he derives from his land, fifteen or twenty years purchase of which is its market value.

That value is three, four, five, or six hundred dollars per acre, while land in Arkansas is now offered in free gift to those who will come and pay the taxes. The sole cause of the difference is, that the owner of the one exchanges directly with the men who make hats and coats, shoes and stockings, ploughs and harrows, and the other does not. To make the land of Arkansas as valuable as that near New York, it would be necessary that its owner should exchange for hats and shoes, ploughs and harrows, as freely as does the man of New York; that is, he must make a market on the land for the products of the land. The return to labour would then be large, and the value of man would rise; but all that was returned over and above the wages of the labourer would be rent, and the value of land would rise. Men would then become free; first, because the cost of raising a slave would be far more than he was worth when raised; and, second, because the land would be too valuable to be cultivated by slaves.

The man of Wisconsin can afford to raise hogs, because corn is but twenty cents a bushel. The man near New York cannot, because corn is worth sixty cents. The man of Arkansas can afford to raise slaves, because they are worth as much as they cost to raise. The man near New York could not, because they would cost him more than their services would repay. Had Arkansas a market on the land for all the products of the land, hired labour would be found so much cheaper that no man would desire to raise a slave.

The man who owns valuable machinery cannot afford to employ poor labour. The interest on his factory is as great if the looms produce but twenty-five yards per day as if they produced fifty. With the former quantity he would be ruined. With the latter he would grow rich. The slave will give him the one—the freeman the other. To make the slave work like the freeman, he must have an inducement—that is, he must receive wages.

Were a large landholder near New York offered the services of men, their wives and families, on the same terms as the planter has those of his slaves—to feed, clothe and lodge them—he could not profitably accept them; and yet the money-price of such labour is at least *twice* as great as at the South. The price of their food, however, would be *thrice* as great, and they would require more clothing, and their children must be educated; and to obtain all these things there would be needed the exertion of the man working for himself, and the economy of one who looked to the future for himself and his family. Were such an offer accepted, the party accepting would speedily find that his people produced less and wasted more than those of his neighbours, and that the rent of his land was diminished by the arrangement.

Place in the Southern States machinery for converting into cloth half a million of bales of cotton, and for producing half a million of tons of bar-iron, and there would be created a great demand for labour. The facility of obtaining iron in exchange for corn and cotton would cause the making of thousands of miles of railroad, and here would be a new demand for labour. The mills, the furnaces, and the roads would bring towns, filled with tailors, shoemakers, hatters, blacksmiths, makers of ploughs and harrows, looms, spindles, and steam-engines, and here would be a new and large demand for labour, while the number of labourers would not be increased. It would then become necessary to economize labour because of its increased value. How could it be done? The slave would do no more than his accustomed work, without an inducement, and that is to be found in wages. The increased product of his labour would thenceforth go to himself.

Large crops would then be obtained in lieu of small ones, and one hundred bushels of corn, or one hundred pounds of cotton would then buy more cloth or iron than now are obtained for three. The increased value of crops would raise the price of land, and if that should average but *ten*



dollars per acre over the South, it would amount to four thousand millions of dollars, and thus would the planters be made rich.

Here, then, are two commodities, man and land, both increasing in value, but the increase in the one goes to the man himself, while that of the other goes to the owner. What would be the effect of this on their market value? Where property is steadily growing in value, it sells for twenty, thirty, and even more years' purchase of its rent. Such would be the case with land.

When property is decreasing in value, it sells for six, eight, or ten years' purchase of the rent that can be commanded for its use. Such would be the case with the slave. With the increased productiveness of his labour he would be obtaining for himself an increased *proportion*, leaving a diminished one to his owner, and thus would the value of the slave be transferred to the land.

To raise a slave would then become too costly. What then would become of the children? The *parents*, everywhere, make sacrifices for their offspring, and by them alone can children be raised, where land is valuable. To induce those sacrifices they must know that they are working for *their own* children, and not for *their master's* slaves.

With increase in the value comes the division of land. Great plantations would become small ones, each of which would yield more than is now yielded by the whole. Small farms would come, cultivated by negro tenants, and thus step by step would men, their wives and children, become free, as their late owners were becoming rich.

To accomplish both these objects it is necessary that the people of the South should have mills and furnaces to make a market on the land for the products of the land. Those they cannot have without protection against the monopoly system by which they are now being exhausted. The abolitionist and the slaveholder should then unite in the demand for the adoption of measures tending to the abolition of the English monopoly of machinery.

The former would, however, say that the process would be too slow. On the contrary, it would be most rapid. Had the tariff of 1828 continued in existence to the present time, the lands of the South would now be trebled in value, and the slaves of the South would now be far advanced towards freedom.

The latter would say that they would lose their property. The answer would be that for every dollar of diminished value in man, they would have five, or ten, or twenty in the increased value of land. It would be precisely as land became valuable that man would become free.

The Union is now agitated by the question whether or not slavery shall be carried beyond its present limits. The agitators are determined to force the Wilmot proviso upon the South, and the people of the latter declare that they will dissolve the Union rather than submit to it. Neither is disposed to penetrate below the surface to understand the cause of difficulty.

If a demand for labour existed in the Slave States, consequent upon making a market on the land for its products, the necessity for *emigration* would pass away, and *immigration* would begin. The people of the South would not then desire to go to California, nor would those of the North deem it necessary to pass laws to prevent them from so doing. All the discord between the different portions of the Union results from the existence of the colonial system, which it is the object of protection to terminate, and thereby raise the value of land and of man, black or white, throughout the world.

This question has thus far been looked at as one of dollars and cents merely, and such is the light in which it should be examined. When it can be shown to be the *interest* of a body of men to pursue a certain course, we may safely calculate upon its being pursued by a large portion of them; but

when we confine ourselves to showing that it is their *duty*, and that in the performance of that duty they must neglect their interests, we may as safely calculate that very few will follow in the course thus indicated. The agitators of the North would impair the value of property and destroy the peace of the South, while deteriorating the condition of the objects of their sympathy, and all this they would do that *others* might be compelled to perform their duties. It is time that the reasonable men, North and South, should understand each other, and determine to adopt the course that would give value to labour and land, and thus relieve themselves from the dangers incident to the agitation of men who would destroy the value of both.

With every step of improvement in the value of land, there would come improvement in the physical and moral condition of its owner. Throughout the South, there is even now a growing indisposition to hold men in slavery; but how rapidly and widely would that feeling extend itself were the owners of land and of slaves to feel themselves growing richer instead of poorer, as is now the case. The cause of emancipation has been going backwards for the last twenty years, and those who desire to know why it is so have only to look to the fact, that, in 1845-6, 600,000,000 of pounds of cotton would not bring as much iron to the plantation as 100,000,000 would have done thirty years before, or 275,000,000 only a dozen years before.\* The consequence has been a growing tendency to the abandonment of land, and an increased regard for that species of property which was capable of being transferred, which land was not. Harassed and annoyed by abolitionists on the one hand, and on the other by a constant deterioration in the value of the only crop upon which he has been accustomed to depend, and compelled to change from that to sugar or to wheat, it is no matter of surprise that there should have been produced the state of feverish excitement now witnessed everywhere in the planting States, and which must increase unless the loom can be brought to take its place by the side of the cotton.

It is a common impression, that the people of South Carolina have exhausted their rich lands, and that they are moving away from poor ones, yet nothing can be more erroneous. They commenced upon poor soils, as has been done in every country of the world, and they are now flying from meadow-lands capable of yielding the finest artificial grasses, of which they have millions of acres untouched; from river bottoms uncleared, from swamps undrained, and from marl, and lime, and iron ore, all of which exist in almost unlimited quantity. Nature has done for that State every thing that could be done; but man has, as yet, done nothing but exhaust the poor soils upon which the work of cultivation was first commenced, and therefore it is that their agricultural reports, and their newspapers repeat, year after year, the question, "What shall the cotton planters do?"

"This," says the editor of the *South Carolinian*, "is a question daily asked by our planting friends. There seems," he continues, "at present great solicitude as to the policy which is to be pursued by them in pitching their next crop. We hear the cry of less cotton and more grain ringing from one end of the State to the other. We are not surprised that many planters who plant heavily should say their present crop will bring them in debt if the ruinous prices continue much longer. No planter can make both ends meet who receives only four or five cents for his cotton, and has to pay the present exorbitant prices for bagging, bale rope, pork, mules, sugar, coffee, salt, and iron. Mules are high, pork is high, bagging and rope are up to the prices of the twelve and fifteen cent times of cotton, and sugar, coffee, iron, and salt steadily stand at the old rates. If to expenditures for these necessary articles, the planter has to add his negro clothes, shoes, hats, and blankets, he will have nothing left to remunerate him for his labour.

---

\* See page 58, *ante*.

These are really matters which they should ponder over, and a system of planting, which does not repay for the labour and investment of capital engaged in it, we reasonably think would soon be abandoned. But it will not be. Our planters are taught no other systems; they do not know how they will supply the vacuum which would be made by an immediate abandonment of the cotton crop. It would take several years before they could perfect, with the strictest economy, those arrangements which would render them entirely independent of it as a marketable crop. Therefore the step taken should be wisely considered before adopted, and the utmost caution should be observed in making, what we sincerely believe would be, if once begun, a radical change in our system of agriculture. We therefore advise, for the coming year, a reduction simply of one-third of the cotton crop throughout the State—devoting, at the same time, the land thus thrown out of the cultivation of this crop to the production of grain and the increase of labour, which would thus be given, to the proper manuring and improved tillage of the cotton planted and the general improvement of the plantation. By this process the cotton lands would be increased in fertility, and the increase of grain which would follow would greatly facilitate the rearing of mules, hogs, cattle, and sheep; and in a short time the whole State could render itself independent of the exactions of our Kentucky neighbours, who kindly supply us with all such things, simply at the expense of the prosperity of our agricultural population; for, in practice, they annually sweep the country of all the surplus cash which is afloat in payment for their bacon and mules. We would, if this system were adopted, soon be able to produce as much cotton on fifty acres as we do now on one hundred; and the investment of the agricultural profits of the State at home, although they might be small, would have a wonderful influence on general prosperity, and build facilities throughout our now desolate and almost unapproachable State, which would not only enchain our own sons to her borders, but induce capitalists to come into our midst, to make their dollars tell by learning us a lesson of practical enterprise. We say to the planters, raise less cotton, more grain, more mules, more hogs; make your own negro clothes; raise sheep—make your own blankets; erect tan-yards—encourage shoemakers and hatters; in fact, artisans of all kinds to settle permanently amongst you; labour at making your soil rich, and do not devote all your energies to wearing it out, and soon all things will go well with you. You will not make so many bales of cotton; in fact, may not cut such a swell on your factors' books; but, take our word for it, you will have happier slaves, richer lands, more thrift and fewer debts, and sleepless thoughts, to harass your hours of rest."

It is impossible to read this without being struck with the fact, that, while, from the exhaustion of her original poor soils, and her inability to clear and drain rich ones, that State is unable to produce cotton in competition with her neighbours, she is a large importer of other agricultural produce. Her chief city is supplied with hay from the North, notwithstanding her abundance of rich meadow land. She consumes the pork of Ohio, and she uses the mules of Kentucky; and thus, while selling her products at the low price that is necessarily consequent upon her distance from the place at which her food and cotton are to be converted into cloth, she buys of others food, mules, &c., at the highest price, because of her distance from the place of production. She wastes labour and manure upon the road, and is then surprised at the exhaustion that results necessarily from such a course of policy.

The remedy for all this may, it is supposed, be found, first, in diminishing the quantity of cotton; but that is already diminishing so rapidly that the great cause of apprehension throughout the State seems to be that its cultivation must soon cease, because of inability to produce it. She desires to diminish the supply of cotton, while her people are flying from her to seek the west, there *to produce more cotton*. Second, the lands are to be manured, but we are not told from whence the manure is to come. The State has scarcely any consumers of agricultural produce except those who are engaged in its production, and their consumption yields but little manure. Her horses are always on the road, wasting the manure yielded by her hay and her corn, and her rice and cotton are consumed abroad, the consequence of



which is, that of what is yielded by the land nothing goes back, and the land and its owner become impoverished together. Her population diminishes. Everybody is seeking to find elsewhere a better place for employing his capital and his labour. Under such circumstances it is useless to talk about artificial manures, and her swamps and river bottoms, in which manure has for ages accumulated, will not pay the cost of clearing for the raising of three or four hundred pounds of cotton to the acre. Give her a consuming population that will make a market on the ground for the tons of potatoes, and turnips, and hay, and the milk, and the veal, that will be yielded by rich soils, and the State will become one of the richest of the Union. It is population that makes food come from the rich soils, as we see to be the case in Belgium, and England, and New England; and it is depopulation that drives men back to the poorer ones, as is shown in Ireland, India, South Carolina, and Virginia. The people of Ireland are flying from each other as if from pestilence, and yet that unfortunate island, in which men are restricted almost entirely to the cultivation of the land, offers us now the chief European market for our surplus food, while South Carolina, destitute of consumers, is one of the principal markets of populous Ohio for her surplus products. Whenever the former shall begin to consume on the land the products of the land, she will have manure to keep in cultivation her poor soils, and she will acquire ability to clear and drain the rich ones, and then she may export hay instead of importing it. Ireland, like South Carolina, abounds in rich soils untouched. She has millions of acres of bog that could be drained with far less labour, and at far less cost, than have been required for similar lands in England, and it is estimated that three millions of these acres would afford food for six millions of people; but, also, like South Carolina, she is compelled to waste on the road the labour and manure yielded by the poorer soils now in cultivation, and is thereby rendered too poor to clear and drain the rich ones, which never have paid, and never can pay, the cost of preparation, without the presence of a consuming population requiring the potatoes, and the turnips, and the hay, of which the earth yields by tons, and not by pounds or bushels.

Had the people of the Southern States, during the last twenty years, been making for themselves, out of their own coal, ore, and limestone, an average of only 250,000 tons of iron, the quantity made in that time would have been five millions of tons, all of which would now be there in the various forms of agricultural and manufacturing machinery, railroads, cars, and locomotives, and they would now be adding to the quantity at the rate of half a million of tons annually.

Fifty thousand tons of iron would make almost 500 miles of single track road. Let us suppose that they averaged annually but half that quantity, and had now, as they might easily have, 5000 miles of road running through populous manufacturing villages in which they were converting their cotton into cloth or yarn for the supply of the world, and then let us estimate what would be the increased value of the landed property of those States. An average annual product exceeding that of the present time to the extent of only *one dollar per acre* of the States south of Mason and Dixon's line, would represent a capital of *six thousand millions of dollars*, being perhaps five times the present value of their slave population, all of which would be at this moment on the highway towards freedom as their masters were making their way towards fortune.\*

Instead of pursuing a course that would have enabled them to profit by the

---

\* Emigration from the rich lands of the older States of the South would then cease, and immigration would begin, and thenceforth the increase in the value of land would be immense.

magnificence of their position, the planters have allowed themselves to be taxed for the maintenance of the people of England, who produce little themselves, and have therefore but very little to give in exchange for the vast mass of agricultural products they receive, the consequence of which is, that their customers are becoming poorer every day, and they themselves are fast passing towards a state of exhaustion similar to that they have produced in Ireland, India, the West Indies, and every other country that has been compelled to submit to their most unnatural system. A writer, describing the present position of affairs, says :—

“As a disinterested spectator of events, I assure you that during a residence of nearly ten years in England, I have not seen the different branches of trade in so disastrous a position as they are at present; and from the petty dealer to the wholesale tradesman, I have never heard so many complaints about the wretched state of trade, not only in the metropolis, but generally throughout the country. I place more confidence in the statements of a dozen respectable tradesmen than I do in ‘trade circulars,’ which are usually got up to serve certain interests, or to cover the real truth, and incite speculation. If I were to give an impartial opinion, I should unhesitatingly say that the repeal of the corn-laws, the repeal of the navigation laws and the railway mania, have together produced the present panic—for it is useless to say that there is not a panic; the leading men of nearly every class declare it by their looks, their words, and their actions.

“The parish of St. Clement’s Danes, one of the richest parishes of the metropolis, where I am now residing, shows the real condition of the general trades-people of London. The Church-warden of this parish recently informed me that *three* applications had been made to the parishioners for the amount of their poor rates and other taxes, and not more than one in twenty had paid their bills, and he intended to issue summonses against the delinquents. He also remarked, that during a residence of eighteen years in this parish, he had never known trade to be so dull as it is now.”

What prospect there is of improvement may be gathered from the following extract from a journal that is the highest free-trade authority in England :—

“We may not unreasonably fear, therefore, that, so far as Ireland is concerned, a considerable source of the progressive increase of the population and wealth of the empire is much diminished, if not absolutely dried up. Other sources of increase have, at the same time, been opened to us; but whether these will balance, or more than balance, the loss occasioned by the condition of Ireland is more than we can say. For many years the condition of the population there was gradually deteriorating, while their numbers increased; that terrible process has at length reached its climax, and the present generation has to sustain the deteriorated, and we fear demoralized mass without any immediate hope of their being restored to habits of productive industry. It seems right to put all classes at once on their guard, lest the decrease of population noticed in the last quarter, may, from the causes we have mentioned, be an index to a permanently slower increase in population than has hitherto taken place.”—*Economist* (London.)

With such a state of things the consumption of our products cannot increase. The question to be answered is, “Can it even be maintained?” Whenever population diminishes in its ratio of growth, it is an evidence of a deterioration of condition, and when that is going on, the first effect is felt in the diminished demand for clothing, for food is the want that must be first supplied.

Let it but be known that the people of this country, North, South, East, and West, are *determined* that the seat of the cotton and iron manufactures of the world is to be here, and the transfer of men and machinery will be such as to exceed all present calculation, and every man that comes will consume three, four, five, six, or twelve times as much cotton as at present, while taking all his food from our own farmers, who then will consume three pounds where now they consume but one. The remedy for all the grievances of the planters is in their own hands, and it lies in the pursuance of a policy advocated by the fathers of the Revolution, and by every chief magistrate of

the Union, from Washington to Jackson, and of all of them but two were from south of Mason and Dixon's line, and all but those two elected by the same party that now repudiates protection.

Of all the chapters in the history of the people of this Union, the most honourable to them, as I believe, is that in which is recorded the history of the negro race. The three hundred thousand barbarians imported into this country are now represented by almost four millions of people, far advanced towards civilization and freedom, and to that number they have grown because they have been well fed, well clothed, well sheltered, and reasonably worked. It is a case totally without a parallel in the world, the history of which may be challenged for the production of a body of men invested with so much power over their fellow-men as has been exercised by the people of the South, and using it so moderately as to permit so rapid an advance in numbers and so great an improvement of condition.

Nevertheless, they are unceasingly stigmatized as slave-drivers and negro-breeders, and by the nation which lives out of them, and which of *all the nations of Europe possessing colonies has most misused its power over the negro race*, because the only one which has established laws prohibiting the consumer and the producer from taking their places by each other. It was remarked many years since, by an intelligent English traveller,\* that to the French islands men went to remain and to exercise trades, but to the English ones they went only to endeavour to make fortunes, and then return. So has it everywhere been, and what have been the results? In India, poverty the most extraordinary, and a succession of famines and pestilences without a parallel; in the West Indies, a waste of life equally unparalleled, requiring constant importations for the mere maintenance of their numbers. From 1817 to 1829, a period of twelve years, the slaves of Jamaica were reduced in numbers, *by death alone*, ten per cent.; whereas had they been here they would have increased thirty per cent. The number imported into that one island could not have been less than double that imported into this Union, and yet, while the larger number is at this day represented by *three hundred thousand*, the smaller is represented by *almost four millions*. The slave chapter of British history is as disgraceful as that of the Union is honourable.

That slavery even yet exists among us, is due to the monopoly system which has destroyed the value of land in Ireland, India, the West Indies, and all other of the British colonies, and yet the nation by which that system was instituted heads the crusade against slavery, while converting the freemen of Ireland and India into slaves, and denouncing the planters, at whose expense she lives, as unworthy to be received into the society of free-born Englishmen; and those very planters are united in the support of the system by which they are impoverished, and the people by whom they are thus denounced!

---

The following article on the position and prospects of the cotton trade, received at the moment that the above was in the press, so fully confirms the views given in a previous chapter, that I am induced, long as it is, to reprint it at full length. It is from the London *Economist*,† the highest free-trade authority in Europe:

"The quarters whence Great Britain draws her supply of raw cotton may be classed under five divisions:—North America, Brazil, Egypt, India, and Miscellaneous Countries, chiefly our own colonies. On the increase of production in these lands, and on the proportion of that increase which is sent to this country, depends our capability of extending our cotton manufacture, or even of maintaining it at its present level. Let us therefore consider each of these sources of supply in turn, that we may be able to form a fair esti-

---

\* Coleridge. Six Months in the West Indies.

† Dec. 1, 1849.



mate of our expectations from each. North America, as the most important, we will leave to the last.

**BRAZIL** is the chief source whence we draw our supply of long-stapled cottons. **Brazil** has sent us as follows:

<i>Brazil Cotton.</i>	
	Bales imported in five years.
1830—1834, inclusive	744,884
1835—1839 —	643,438
1840—1844 —	471,226
1845—1849 —	495,685
	Bales imported per annum.
	148,977
	128,687
	94,245
	99,137

In this and the succeeding tables the imports for 1849 have been found by adding to the *known* imports for the first ten months, the quantity we have yet reason to expect, or that which ordinarily arrives in November and December.

From Brazil, therefore, our annual supply has diminished nearly 50,000 bales; or if we compare the two extreme years of the series, 1830 and 1848, the falling off is from 192,267 bales to 100,244, or 92,000 bales.

**EGYPT.**—Our Egyptian supply, which is also long-stapled cotton, has ranged as follows:—

<i>Egyptian Cotton.</i>	
	Bales imported in five years.
1830—1834, inclusive	99,899
1835—1839 —	173,031
1840—1844 —	207,913
1845—1849 —	224,579
	Bales imported per annum.
	19,899
	34,606
	41,583
	44,918

The supply from Egypt, however, seems to have reached its maximum in 1845, in which year we received 81,344 bales. This year it does not reach half that amount. Moreover, this country, from the peculiar circumstances of its government, is little to be relied upon,—the supply having varied from 40,290 bales in 1832 to 2,569 bales in 1833; and again from 18,245 bales in 1842, to 66,000 bales in 1844.

From **OTHER QUARTERS**, chiefly the West Indies, the supply has been:—

<i>Miscellaneous.</i>	
	Bales imported in five years.
1830—1834, inclusive	68,873
1835—1839 —	161,369
1840—1844 —	117,887
1845—1849 —	44,833
	Bales imported per annum.
	13,775
	32,274
	23,577
	8,966

**EAST INDIES.**—Our supply from this quarter varies enormously, from 90,000 to 270,000 bales per annum, inasmuch as we only receive that proportion of the crop which our prices may divert from China or from internal consumption. Our imports thence have been as follows.

<i>East India Cotton.</i>	
	Bales imported in five years.
1830—1834, inclusive	403,976
1835—1839 —	723,263
1840—1844 —	1,167,294
1845—1849 —	899,213
	Bales imported per annum.
	80,795
	144,653
	233,459
	179,852

The summary of our supply from all these quarters combined is:—

<i>Summary.</i>	
	Imports in five years.
1830—1834, inclusive	1,317,632
1835—1839 —	1,701,101
1840—1844 —	1,964,320
1845—1849 —	1,664,310
	Imports per annum.
	263,526
	340,220
	392,864
	332,862

The result of this inquiry, then is, that our average annual supply from all quarters, *except the United States*, was in five years ending 1849 *less* by 7,358 bales than in the five years ending 1839, and *less* by 60,000 bales than in the five years ending 1844. Of this *diminished* supply, moreover, we have been exporting an *increasing* quantity, *viz.*—396,000 bales in the last five years, against 342,000 bales the previous five years.

UNITED STATES.—We may now turn our attention to our last and main source of supply, America, which has sent us:—

*American Cotton.*

	Imports in five years.	Imports per annum.
1830—1834, inclusive	3,241,958	648,391
1835—1839 —	4,308,610	861,722
1840—1844 —	5,802,829	1,160,566
1845—1849 —	6,188,144	1,237,619

The last five years, it should be observed, include the three largest crops ever known, one very deficient, and one rather so.

It is a known and admitted fact among those conversant with these matters, that a price of 4*d.* a lb. for middling uplands, laid down in Liverpool, leaves sufficient profit to the American planter to induce him to grow as much cotton as his negroes can gather; and that, therefore, as the average price has scarcely ever ranged so low as this for any great number of weeks, the *possible* increase of the crop of cotton will keep pace with the *actual* increase of the Negro population; and cannot do more. Now the negroes increase at a very regular rate of 3 per cent. per annum. If, therefore, these premises be correct, it will follow that the cotton crop of each year will surpass that of each preceding year of *equally favourable conditions* (*i. e.*, as to good planting and picking weather, late frosts, freedom from worms, inundations, &c.) by 3 per cent. Accordingly, we find this to have been pretty closely the case, as the following tables will show. The years 1840, 1843, and 1845, were very favourable years for the growth and gathering of cotton. Let us see what crop each of these years, calculated on the above bases (3 per cent. yearly increase,) would give for 1849, also a favourable year:—

	Actual crop.	No. of years.	Per cent.	Estimated crop of 1849.
1840	2,178,000	.9	27	2,866,000
1843	2,379,000	.6	18	2,807,220
1845	2,394,000	.4	12	2,681,280
Average				2,784,833
Actual crop				2,730,000

From the following table it will be seen that, assuming the year 1838 as a starting point, the average increase of the American crop for the last 12 years has not quite reached 3 per cent.: and in fact wherein for any short series of years this rate has been exceeded, it has been attributable simply to an unusual run of favourable seasons.

Year.	What the crop would have been with no extraordinary casualties, and increasing at the rate of 3 per cent. yearly.	Actual crop.
1837—38	—	1,801,500
1838—39	1,855,500	1,360,500
1839—40	1,911,200	2,178,000
1840—41	1,968,500	1,635,000
1841—42	2,027,500	1,683,500
1842—43	2,088,300	2,379,000
1843—44	2,151,000	2,030,500
1844—45	2,215,000	2,394,500
1845—46	2,282,000	2,100,500
1846—47	2,350,500	1,778,500
1847—48	2,421,000	2,347,500
1848—49	2,493,000	2,728,500
1849—50	2,568,300	2,350,000 estimated
Average	2,194,400	2,080,500

It is clear, then, that we shall be sufficiently near the mark for any practical conclusions, if we assume the average increase of the American cotton crop at 3 per cent. per annum, barring any *unusual* freedom from, or occurrence of, disasters, such as sometimes happen. Let us now inquire what proportion of this increase will fall to our share.

The consumption of the United States itself has been steadily on the advance, and now increases at an average annual rate of about 35,000 bales. It is now about 520,000 bales yearly. That of the continent now reaches (of American cotton) about 700,000 bales. America and the continent, therefore, require about 1,200,000 bales at present, and will require more each year. Moreover, they will always take precedence of Great

Britain, as their margin of profit is larger, and a small increase of price is of less consequence to their manufacturers than to ours, and checks consumption less. The following table will throw much light on this question :

5 Years.	Crop of American cotton.	Import of American cotton into Great Britain.	Export of American cotton from Great Britain.	American cotton retained for home consumption.
1840—44	9,905,638	5,802,829	295,600	5,507,229
1845—49	11,349,921	6,188,144	596,640	5,591,504
Increase	1,444,283	385,315	301,040	84,275

From this table it appears, that, while the *growth* of American cotton in the last five years exceeded that of the previous five by the unprecedented quantity of nearly one million and a half of bales, of this increase only 385,000 reached this country, and of this we had to re-export more than three-fourths, leaving an annual increase available for home consumption of only 17,000 bales. For any augmentation of consumption beyond this, we have been drawing on our stocks.

We will now bring into one view the *whole* supply and the *whole* consumption of all kinds of cotton in Great Britain during the last ten years :

Years.	Bales imported from all quarters.	Bales exported.	Retained for home consumption.	Supply for home consumption annually.	Actual consumption annually.	Actual consumption weekly.
1840—44	7,767,149	637,650	7,129,499	1,425,900	1,290,480	24,810
1845—49	7,852,454	992,850	6,859,604	1,371,920	1,477,360	28,410
Increase	85,305	355,200	. . .	. . .	186,880	3,600
Decrease	. . .	. . .	269,895	53,980		

We have taken the actual consumption of 1849 at 1,650,000 bales only, for reasons hereafter stated.

Now, bearing in mind that the figures in the above tables are, with scarcely an exception, ascertained facts, and not estimates, let us sum the conclusions to which they have conducted us; conclusions sufficient, if not to alarm us, yet certainly to create much uneasiness, and to suggest great caution on the part of all concerned, directly or indirectly, in the great manufacture of England. .

1. That our supply of cotton from miscellaneous quarters (*excluding* the United States) has for many years been decidedly, though irregularly, *decreasing*.

2. That our supply of cotton *from all quarters*, (including the United States,) available for home consumption, has of late years been falling off at the rate of 1,000 bales a week, while our consumption has been increasing during the same period at the rate of 3,600 bales a week.

3. That the United States is the only country where the growth of cotton is on the increase; and that there even the increase does not on an average exceed 3 per cent., or 80,000 bales annually, which is barely sufficient to supply the increasing demand for its own consumption, and for the continent of Europe.

4. That no stimulus of price can materially augment this annual increase, as the planters always grow as much cotton as the negro population can pick.

5. That, consequently, if the cotton manufacture of Great Britain is to increase at all, on its present footing, it can only be enabled to do so by applying a great stimulus to the growth of cotton in other countries adapted for the culture.

Within the memory of many now living, a great change has taken place in the countries from which our main bulk of cotton is procured. In the infancy of the manufacture, our chief supply came from the Mediterranean, especially from Smyrna and Malta. Neither of the places now sends us more than a few chance bags occasionally. In the last century, the West Indies were our principal source; in the year 1786, out of 20,000,000 lbs. imported, 5,000,000 came from Smyrna, and the rest from the West Indies; in 1848, the West Indies sent us only about 1,300 bales; in 1781, Brazil began to send us cotton, and the supply thence continued to increase, though irregularly, till 1830, since which time it has fallen off to one-half. About 1822, Egyptian cotton began to come in considerable quantities, its cultivation having been introduced into that country two years before. The import exceeded 80,000 bales in 1845; the average of the last three years has not been a third of that quantity. Cotton has always been grown largely in Hindostan; but it did not send much to England till about thirty years ago. In the five years ending 1824, the yearly average import was 33,500 bales; in 1841, it reached 274,000, and may now be roughly estimated at 200,000 bales a year.



Now, what is the reason why these countries, after having at one time produced so largely and so well, should have ceased or curtailed their growth within recent years? It is clearly a question of price. Let us consider a few of the cases:

At the close of the years	Lowest price of Fernambuco.	Fall per. ct.	Lowest price of Maranh.	Fall per. ct.	Lowest price of Egyptian.	Fall per. ct.	Lowest price of Surat.	Fall per. cent.
1836—39 inclusive	9½ <i>d.</i>	—	8¼ <i>d.</i>	—	10¼ <i>d.</i>	—	4½ <i>d.</i>	—
1840—43 . . .	7	—	5½	—	7	—	3½	—
1844—48 . . .	5⅞	36	4⅞	42	5⅞	43	2¼	40

Here, surely, may be read the explanation of the deplorable falling off in our miscellaneous supply. From the four years ending 1839, when the great stimulus was given which procured us so ample a supply during the succeeding period, to the quinquennial period ending 1848, there has been a fall in price, on an average, of 40 per cent. Unless, therefore, we assume either an enormous margin of profit in the earlier period, or an extreme diminution in the cost of producing the article of late years, such a fall in price would be quite sufficient to direct capital and industry into other channels, and to prevent so bulky an article as cotton from being grown or forwarded.

In both Brazil and India, freight and carriage form an inordinate proportion of the price of cotton. In both countries the bales are carried great distances on the backs of mules or other beasts of burden. The deficiency of good roads, convenient vehicles, and safely navigable rivers, in the cotton districts of both countries, swells the expense of bringing the bales to the shipping ports to such an extent, that, when prices are low in England, the ultimate net remittance to the planter is quite insufficient to repay the cost of growing, picking, and packing. In some years, the price of much of the Surat cotton sent to this country was so low as only to remit *one penny* a pound to the shipper at Bombay; and by the time this reached the actual grower, it had probably dwindled away, through the expenses of carriage, to a sum inadequate even to pay the government rent. Our supply from both these countries will depend entirely upon price. In Brazil, where we believe the sugar cultivation is less profitable than formerly, a range of prices 50 per cent. higher than those of the last few years would probably induce the planters to increase their cotton grounds, and would repay them for so doing. In regard to the East Indies, where large quantities are always grown, our supply thence depends upon two things—first, the demand for China, which is usually supplied before Great Britain; and, secondly, on the question whether the net price at Bombay or Madras will pay for picking, cleaning, packing, and transporting to the coast. Under the stimulus of high prices, (such as prevail at this moment,) large quantities, would, we doubt not, be sent forward; and the price that will be requisite to secure such large supplies will diminish as the means of carriage are increased and cheapened. If the prices of the last five years continue, we believe there can be no doubt that the supply will inevitably continue to fall off.

We do not, however, participate in the sanguine expectations which many parties entertain, that even with higher prices the quantity and quality of East Indian cotton sent to this country can progress so rapidly as to render us at all independent of the American supply. For, in the first place, the absence of good roads or navigable rivers in the cotton districts, the length of time and expenditure of capital needed before the want of those can be supplied by the establishment of railroads, and the languid and unenterprising character of the people, must necessarily cause any material increase of supply (at least over 250,000 bales per annum) to be a matter of very slow and costly operation. And, in the second place, the *quality* of the cotton grown in India is peculiar; and this peculiarity is still traceable, though in a modified degree, in whatever locality and from whatever seed the plant is grown, even in the best specimens (improved as they unquestionably are) which have of late been sent to this country; and this peculiarity will always, we fear, prevent it from being substitutable for American cotton, except to a very limited extent.

Our hopes lie in a very different direction; we look to our West Indian, African, and Australian colonies, as the quarters from which, would government only afford every possible facility, (we ask and wish for no more,) we might, ere long, draw such a supply of cotton as would, to say the least, make the fluctuations of the American crop, and the varying proportion of it which falls to our share, of far less consequence to our prosperity than they now are.

The West Indies, as we have already seen, used to send us, sixty years ago, about 40,000 bales, or three-fourths of our then supply. But the enormous profits realized on

the growth of sugar, partly caused, and much prolonged, by our prohibitory duties on all competing sugars, directed the attention of the colonists exclusively in that direction. As in the analogous case of protected wheat in this country, other cultivation was gradually abandoned in favour of a single article; the cane was grown in soils and localities utterly unfit for it, and into which nothing but the protective system could have forced it, and cotton was soon altogether neglected. Many parts of the West Indies, St. Vincent especially, which are worst adapted for the cane, are the best adapted for the cotton plant, which flourishes in light and dry soils, and especially near the sea-coast. The artificial stimulus which our mistaken policy so long applied to sugar cultivation, having been withdrawn, it must be abandoned in all unsuitable localities, and would be well replaced by cotton. What price would be required to repay its culture there, we cannot say; but considering at how small a cost it might be placed on ship-board in all these colonies, and how large a portion this item generally forms of the whole expense of production, we cannot see why cotton should not be grown in the Antilles as cheaply as in the United States, if only the negroes can be relied upon for steady and continuous labour during the picking season. Now, the price of West Indian cotton ranges higher than that of the bulk of the American crop, as being longer in staple. Our belief is, that were the attention of our planters once energetically directed to this article, they might soon send us a regular supply of 100,000 bales per annum, and thus find a use for many estates that must otherwise be abandoned.

The experiment of cotton growing has already been tried with success in one of our most hopeful African colonies—Port Natal. We have already received above 100 bales from this colony—the main portion of which consists of the indigenous cotton, very similar to that shipped from New Orleans, clean, fine, tenacious, but of a light brown colour. On the whole, it is a most admirable article for ordinary purposes, and worth in the market to-day nearly 7d. per pound. The remainder of the shipments have been grown from the sea-island seed, and are of excellent quality. The cultivation is rapidly increasing, and about 500 bales are expected next year from the colony. A society has been formed for promoting emigration thither, and a ship full of emigrants sailed a few days since. Mr. Byrne, the agent, says:

“Natal is situated in a sunny and bright region. It has iron, lead, coal, and copper in abundance, and with British industry might be made one of the finest and wealthiest countries on the globe. The country is admirably calculated for the growth of cotton, some of which is of a superior description. In America, cotton was chiefly cultivated by slave-labour at a cost of about 35*l.* a year for each slave; whereas at Natal the labour of the Zooloos could be purchased at a cost of 10*s.* a month; and Natal too, from its proximity to the sea, was most advantageously situated for carrying on the trade with England in competition with the States. I would not advise you to cultivate sugar; you will be able to get that article perhaps better from the Mauritius, where you will find a highly remunerative market for all agricultural produce. I intend in the beginning of the year to send out a screw steamer to run to and from that island and Natal.”

From Australia we have as yet had no bulk of supply, but several acres are under cultivation, and the samples sent are of so fine a quality as to prove beyond question the adaptation of the soil and climate for the production of as good an article as any grown in America. We have now lying before us, along with the Port Natal cotton, samples of some grown from sea-island seed at Bolwarra, in New South Wales, near Maitland, about 80 miles north of Sydney. It is long, fine, and silky.

We believe that, under due encouragement, the cultivation of cotton in these quarters might increase in a steady ratio equal to our increasing demand. Let us now see, on a summary, how the matter stands.

We have seen that of the American cotton crop, our annual supply during the last five years has nearly reached 1,120,000 bales, and that, *the yearly increase of the crop being balanced by the yearly increasing demand for the United States and for the continent*, there is little probability of our ever getting more than this *on an average*. Let us suppose that a due advance in price raises the production of Brazil to what it had attained in 1830, and that of India nearly to what it was in 1841, and that Egypt and our own colonies will again send us some appreciable and increasing imports:

	Bales per annum.	
United States . . . . .	say	1,200,000
Brazil . . . . .		200,000
India . . . . .		250,000
Egypt . . . . .		50,000
Our colonies . . . . .		50,000
		<u>1,750,000</u>

This would allow us a supply of 33,500 bales a week, the apparent consumption of this year. For any addition to this we must depend on the increase of the colonial supply, or on that which a still higher range of prices will enable us to wring out of India and Brazil. The conclusion from the whole clearly is, that, in order to secure such a supply of the raw material as is needed to meet our own present consumption, *we must be prepared to pay a decidedly higher range of prices than has of late years obtained*; that, in fact, the average prices of the last five years have proved quite inadequate, in spite of large crops in America, to draw to this country sufficient cotton to enable our actual machinery to work full time. Higher prices, therefore, *must* obtain in future; nor should spinners and manufacturers wish it otherwise; for experience has fully shown them that no circumstances can cause them so great or so certain a loss as an inadequate supply of the raw material, and higher prices can alone avert this supreme evil.

So much as to the probable sufficiency of the supply of the raw material to this country, *on the supposition that the consumption is what it appears to be, and will continue what it is*. But are we justified in these two assumptions? Let us put together a few facts which bear upon the question.

And, first, let us ascertain what the actual consumption has been during the last ten years. We know this with accuracy for nine years, and for the first ten months of this year. During these ten months, the deliveries to the trade have reached 1,495,000 bales. But we know that, during the latter portion of this period, manufacturers have been purchasing far more than they need for actual use, and that, while the actual quantity worked up has, in consequence of a general tendency towards the production of finer fabrics, been decreasing since the beginning of June, the purchases of cotton have been increasing, till, in October, they reached the unprecedented amount of 217,000 bales. A lull has now taken place, and we believe we shall not be far wrong in assuming that the purchases of the trade, during the last nine weeks of this year, will not exceed 205,000 bales; and that, in that case, they will hold at the end of the year 50,000 bales more than usual in stock. This would give the consumption of the year at 1,650,000 bales. Our own impression is, that this estimate is rather over than under the mark, and that spinners hold a larger stock than we assume; but, in any case we cannot be sufficiently wide of the truth to affect our conclusions.

Year.	Weekly consumption of cotton in Great Britain.	Year.	Weekly consumption of cotton in Great Britain.
1840 . . . .	24,868	1845 . . . .	30,120
1841 . . . .	22,134	1846 . . . .	30,000
1842 . . . .	22,949	1847 . . . .	21,270
1843 . . . .	26,693	1848 . . . .	28,950
1844 . . . .	27,439	1849 . . . .	31,730

Now, we wish our readers to consider this table carefully, and notice the extraordinary fluctuations in the quantity of cotton worked up each year, in connection with the facts we are about to state. The weekly average fell nearly 3,000 bales from 1840 to 1841; then jumped up nearly 4,000 bales from 1842 to 1843; in 1845 and 1846, it remained stationary at a high figure; and (passing over for obvious reasons the anomalous year of 1847) it had again fallen in 1848, when the quantity only exceeded that of eight years previously by 4,000 bales. *Yet, during the whole of this period, the machinery engaged in the cotton manufacture was constantly, though not regularly, increasing*; and, except for a short period in 1842, (and in 1847, which last year we have thrown out of our calculation,) the mills were, we believe we are correct in stating, all at full work. Indeed, "short time" is attended with too tremendous a loss to the mill-owner ever to be resorted to, except under the direst pressure. During the last year, we see the consumption has increased nearly 3,000 bales a week, though the hours of labour have been reduced, by legislative enactment, from eleven to ten per diem.

All these considerations point clearly to the conclusion, that *our consumption of the raw material is not a fixed, but a varying quantity*, and is affected by some other causes than either the amount of machinery in operation, or the hours during which it is employed. What this cause is, and the extent to which it is capable of operating, we can be at no loss to discover.

The weight of raw cotton consumed by a given amount of machinery varies according to the nature of the article produced. We produce in England fabrics of which the raw material forms *two-thirds* of the value, and fabrics of which it forms *not one-fiftieth* of the value. We spin yarns of which the raw materials cost *three-fourths*, and yarns of which it costs *one-twentieth*, of the finished price. We have spindles that produce two pounds of yarn a week, and spindles that do not produce two pounds a quarter. But, without



going to these extreme varieties, we will here copy a statement made by Messrs. Du Fay & Company in their monthly circular, the accuracy of which we can fully confirm. They say :

840 spindles, working 20's twist, will consume 1,340 lbs. of cotton							
840	"	"	30's	"	"	840	"
840	"	"	40's	"	"	525	"
840	"	"	60's	"	"	224	"

Now, though machinery accustomed to produce No. 20's cannot produce No. 60's, yet it can, without material change or difficulty, produce No. 30's; and machinery adapted for No. 30's can change to No. 40's, and so on. In fact, every mill has a range of *at least ten numbers*, by varying which it can reduce or augment its consumption of cotton *easily* from 25 to 50 per cent. The same may be said of weaving mills. In many mills, looms may be seen working side by side of the same construction, some of which produce 60 lbs. a week, and others only 25 lbs. We could mention at least one mill where the amount of raw cotton worked up weekly varies, according to the fineness of the article produced, to meet the fluctuating demands of the market, from 30,000 lbs. to 18,000 lbs.; and we find in the *Manchester Guardian* of last Saturday the following corroborative statement:

"Some idea of what a change of numbers will effect may be gathered from the following instances; the names of the firms are before us :

						Reduction.	Previous weekly consumption.
No. 1	.	.	.	.	.	10,000 lbs. out of	40,000 lbs.
No. 2	.	.	.	.	.	18,000 lbs.	— 60,000 lbs.
No. 3	.	.	.	.	.	25,000 lbs.	— 115,000 lbs.
No. 4	.	.	.	.	.	10,000 lbs.	— 30,000 lbs.
No. 5	.	.	.	.	.	10,000 lbs.	— 30,000 lbs.
No. 6	.	.	.	.	.	70 bbs.	— 120 bales.

We have been informed by another very extensive spinner, that the reduction in his establishment is more than 40,000 lbs. per week."

It is not easy to ascertain the extent to which this change from coarser to finer numbers is actually carried at any particular period. We know, however, that it does go on to a very great extent, and has done so, perhaps almost unprecedentedly, during the last six months; and, when we consider the immense proportion of the *weight* of cotton used in England, which is consumed by the makers of heavy cloths and coarse yarns, we think we may safely affirm that a *brisk* demand for printers, shirtings, and India yarns on the one hand, with a *dull* demand for domestics, long-cloths, and German yarns on the other, or a reversal of these conditions of the market, if continued for any time, will make a difference of at least 25 per cent. in the weight of raw cotton consumed.

Now, an advance in the price of cotton is much more strongly felt in the coarser yarns and the heavier cloths than in the finer ones. An advance, such as has taken place in the last twelve months, of nearly 3*d.* per lb. on the raw material of a stout calico which ordinarily sells in the finished state, at 8*d.* per lb. is nearly 40 per cent. on the manufactured article. On a printing cloth, or a fine shirting, which sells at 12*d.* per lb. it is only 25 per cent.; and on the piece *when printed*, it is far less than this—in fact a mere trifle. Or, to put it in a still clearer light, an advance of 3*d.* per lb. on a heavy domestic calico, will compel the purchaser to pay 4*d.* where he formerly only paid 3*d.* *per yard*. The same 3*d.* per lb. will be 15*d.* on a piece of printing cloth 30 yards in length, which, when printed, sells in the shops at about 12*s.* 6*d.*; in other words, it will raise the price to the customer from 5*d.* to 5½*d.* *per yard*. Now, this advance, which is only ten per cent., is not sufficient materially or rapidly to check consumption; the other advance, which is 40 per cent., is. It is clear, therefore, that an advance in the price of the raw material will check the demand for, and consequently the production of, heavy fabrics, much sooner and more decidedly than that of light ones. Accordingly, as the following table will show, *the range of prices* is more limited in the former than in the latter; and never keeps pace with, or nearly so, that of the raw material:—

	Price per lb. of the following articles in November.						Extreme range.
	1845. d.	1846. d.	1847. d.	1848. d.	1849. d.		
Raw cotton, fair uplands . . . . .	4½	6	5½	4	6½	2½	
No. 20's water twist, good seconds . . . . .	9	8½	7¾	6½	8½	2½	
No. 40's mule twist, fair seconds . . . . .	10	9½	8½	7	9½	3	
Stout domestics, 18½ lbs. for 60 yds. . . . .	9½	9½	9½	8	8½	1½	
Medium domestics, 12 lbs. for 60 yds. . . . .	11¾	11½	9¾	9½	10	2½	
Printing cloths, 27 in. 72 reed, 5 lbs. 2 oz. . . . .	13	13½	12½	10¾	14½	3½	

It is obvious from this table that while printing cloths have a range of price even exceeding that of raw cotton, and find no difficulty, where there is a reasonably brisk

trade, in following its fluctuations, the very reverse is the case with heavy domestics, into which a very disproportionate bulk of the raw material is worked up, when compared with the machinery employed. For these last-mentioned articles there is a very extensive demand *at low prices*; but with any material advance, this demand immediately falls off. A great proportion of them is exported in the form of T cloths and long-cloths to Portugal, the Mediterranean, and the Levant, as long as prices range about 8d. a lb.—when it approaches 9d. this export is almost wholly suspended, and the manufacturers who ordinarily supply it, are compelled to turn their attention to other fabrics.

Another cause contributes to this change. In unprofitable years, such as always occur when the raw material is deficient in quantity and has rapidly become enhanced in value, (as in the present year,) every manufacturer is of course anxious both to minimize his loss, and to make his capital go as far, and last as long, as he can. It is evident that this will be best effected by turning his machinery to the finest range of numbers it is fitted to produce, and working up (say) 20,000 lbs. instead of 30,000 lbs. of cotton weekly. Moreover, in years when trade is dull, and when manufacturers, from inability to sell, are compelled to accumulate stocks, the same inducement to produce as fine fabrics as possible is still more strongly felt. A manufacturer with 500 looms on light printing cloths can afford to hold a stock of 50,000 pieces, or four months' production, but a manufacturer with 500 looms must have a much larger capital who can afford to hold 25,000 pieces, or four months' production of heavy domestics. In round numbers, the first would have 12,000*l.* and the second 18,000*l.* locked up.

From a combination of all the above considerations—from observing that this change from coarser to finer fabrics has often occurred in the past—from knowing how easily, and to what an extent, it may be effected—and from perceiving the vast inducement which such a rise in the value of cotton as has recently occurred offers to this change—we feel no doubt that such change has, during the last six months, been carried to a far greater extent than is generally estimated; and we question whether the actual consumption is at this moment within 5000 bales per week of what it appeared to be in May last, nor within 3000 of what it actually was. We feel convinced, too, that with our present and future prospects as to the supply and price of the raw material, as developed in the early part of this paper, our manufacture must run more than it has done of late years upon the finer yarns and fabrics, and consequently that our consumption of cotton (till the supply from miscellaneous quarters has been greatly augmented) must tend to *decrease* rather than otherwise, notwithstanding the increase and improvement of machinery; that (to sum up the whole) *those speculators who refuse to believe in a diminished consumption, and those manufacturers who refuse to face the fact of an inadequate supply, will find themselves equally in error, and in danger.* We particularly call the attention of the latter parties to the consideration that the better or worse accounts of the coming American crop in no degree affect our argument. We have assumed it at 2,350,000 bales—the highest estimate being 2,400,000 bales.

There are yet other reflections which tend to corroborate this conclusion. We are not without indications that we have over-estimated and outrun the demand for the manufactured article from our existing markets, as much as we have outrun the supply of the raw material from existing sources. It is probable that the world's requirement of cotton goods about keeps pace with the world's growth of cotton wool. But unfortunately our machinery has increased faster than either. We can produce more calico than is wanted, and we can consume more cotton than is grown. We think that, in endeavouring to ascertain this, we may safely take the data of the last five years as our basis, since, though the demand for our manufactures has in that period been checked by a tremendous political and commercial convulsion, yet on the other hand it has been increased during a portion of that time by an unexampled expenditure among the working classes, (in the form of wages to railway labourers and others,) and the supply has been checked by one of the most deficient cotton crops known for many years.

We have constructed the following tables with the greatest care, and from the best information we can obtain. We believe they will be found essentially correct:—

No. 20's *Water twist.*

	Price of cotton per lb.	Cost of workman- ship and waste.	Total cost.	Selling price.	Profit.	Loss.
	d.	d.	d.	d.	d.	d.
1845	4.25	3	7.25	9	1.75	—
1846	6	3.25	9.25	8.25	—	1
1847	4.7	3.1	7.8	7.8	—	—
1848	3.6	3	6.6	6.25	—	0.35
1849	6.25	3.20	9.45	8.45	—	1
			23			

*No. 40's Mule twist.*

	Price of cotton.	Cost of workman- ship and waste.	Total cost.	Selling price.	Profit.	Loss.
	d.	d.	d.	d.	d.	d.
1845	4.5	4	8.5	10	1.5	—
1846	6	4.2	10.2	9.25	—	0.95
1847	5	4.1	9.1	8.25	—	0.85
1848	4	4	8	7	—	1
1849	6.5	4.2	10.7	9.25	—	1.45

The prices here given are those of November in each year, both in this and the subsequent tables.

*Stout Domestics.*

	Price of cotton per lb.	Workmanship and waste.	Total cost.	Selling price.	Profit.	Loss.
	d.	d.	d.	d.	d.	d.
1845	3.75	4	7.75	9.25	1.5	—
1846	5.6	4.2	9.8	9.36	—	0.5
1847	4.25	4	8.25	9.25	1	—
1848	3.25	3.35	7.1	8	0.9	—
1849	5.7	4	9.8	8.75	—	1.05

*Medium Domestics.*

	Price of cotton per lb.	Workmanship and waste.	Total cost.	Selling price.	Profit.	Loss.
	d.	d.	d.	d.	d.	d.
1845	4.25	5.50	9.75	11.75	2	—
1846	6	5.75	11.75	11.25	—	0.5
1847	4.75	5.25	10	9.75	—	0.25
1848	3.65	5	8.65	9.25	0.6	—
1849	6.45	5.5	11.75	10	—	1.75

In estimating the second column in all these tables, we have taken into account both the economy, in the cost of workmanship, where there has been any, and also the variation in the waste owing to the varying price of cotton, which will account for the slight fluctuations observable.

*Printing Cloths.*

	Price of cotton.	Workmanship and waste.	Total cost.	Selling price.	Profit.	Loss.
	d.	d.	d.	d.	d.	d.
1845	5	6.85	11.85	13	1.15	—
1846	6.5	7	13.5	13.25	—	0.25
1847	5.5	6.75	12.25	12.25	—	—
1848	4.5	6.5	11	10.75	—	0.25
1849	6.25	6.75	13.5	14.25	0.75	—

It is important to observe that the experience of isolated *individuals* will not invalidate the conclusions of these tables, which show the margin between the raw material and the manufactured article *at the prices of the day*. These prices vary much during the year; and a manufacturer who has laid in his cotton at the cheapest time, and made his contracts of sale at the dearest, may realize a profit, though the general trade incurs a loss. The only case in which these tables may lead to an incorrect conclusion is, where the relative prices in *November* are not fair representatives of the average prices of the year. In the year 1847 this was the case, the margin between cotton and yarn, or cotton and cloth, being much *greater* in November than during the chief part of the year, and the *loss* consequently far *less*. The average of that year left a large loss on all articles.

From these tables it would appear—as indeed has been well known to all connected with the trade—that our cotton-spinners and manufacturers on an average, and with a few exceptions, have been carrying on their works to a loss, ever since 1845. This has occurred during a period in which the price of the raw material has fluctuated upwards and downwards at least 40 per cent. Now can it be supposed that they would have encountered the impossibility, which it is evident they *have* encountered, of obtaining remunerating prices, if they had not produced more than our actual markets can, on an average of years, take off?

At the beginning of this year, great expectations were entertained of our home demand. It was argued, and with good reason, that we never yet had a year of general employment and low prices of provisions combined, which was not also a year of very large domestic consumption of manufactured fabrics. This year labour has been in very brisk request, and food has never been so cheap and plentiful since 1836. Yet our expectations



from these facts have not been fully answered. The sellers of printing cloths and medium shirtings report that their home demand has, on the whole, been good; the sellers of domestics report, on the contrary, a decidedly dull business, worse than that of last year; but we believe all agree that the anticipations with which they began the year have by no means been realized. We suspect the cause to be this:—The depreciation in railway property, the effects of the Irish famine, and the commercial crash in 1847, have impoverished all classes of the community to a much greater extent than has been allowed for in the calculations of our tradesmen. We question whether “the power of purchase,” on the part of the British community, is nearly equal to what it was in 1845. One fact alone may enable us to guess at the degree to which its aggregate means of expenditure must have been reduced. In round numbers, the sum *actually expended* in railways is 210 millions: their *actual value* at the prices of the day does not exceed 100 millions; and many of them pay little or no dividend.

Let us now sum up the conclusions which our tables have solved:—

1. Our supply of cotton has materially fallen off during the last few years, and will not increase except under the stimulus of much higher prices than have (till the last few months) obtained.

2. That under such ranges of prices our consumption will not maintain its present apparent rate, (or say 32,000 bales a week,) whatever be the increase or improvement of machinery.

3. That, except under the stimulus of low prices, our existing markets *cannot* take off as much as our machinery *can* produce.

4. That the practical deductions pointed to by these facts are two—*first*, a permanent tendency towards the production of finer fabrics; and *secondly*, a check to the increase of mills and machinery—of our producing power—that is, till the increased supply of the raw material on the one hand, and an increased consumption of the manufactured product on the other, shall once more have restored the balance.”

It is here stated that the consumption of the last five years is greater by 2600 bales per week than in the previous five, but it is not shown whence this cotton came. The whole quantity retained for consumption in the second period is less by 269,000 bales than in the first, and yet the consumption is said to have been greater by 187,000 per annum, or a total quantity of 935,000 bales, which added to the deficiency in the quantity retained, would make 1,200,000 bales. The stock of American on hand at the close of 1849 was less by 400,000 bales, and that of other descriptions may have been reduced 250,000; but even this leaves 550,000 to be accounted for. It is scarcely possible to examine the figures given in this paper without arriving at the conclusion that the consumption is exaggerated.

Admitting, however, all that is claimed, I will now proceed to show how large a portion of this increase has resulted from the existence of *protection* elsewhere. It has been shown\* that our import of cotton goods in two years, ending June 30, 1843, the period of *almost free trade*, was very small, the average having been but \$7,184,000. If, now, to this we add the increased import of the year ending June, 1844, we obtain an average of about . \$9,000,000  
From June, 1844, to June, 1849, the average was about . 16,000,000  
During one-half of this period the tariff of 1842 was in existence, and during more than half of the balance, that of 1846 was almost altogether inoperative—and for the balance of the time the duty has been thirty per cent. Nevertheless, the amount *imported*† has been almost double, and the excess is not less than three-fourths of a pound per head, making an average of about 35,000 bales per annum.

\* Page 394, *ante*.

† By reference to the tables in Chapters II. and III. it will be seen that much of these imports in the last two years was obtained in exchange for certificates of debt, and therefore deducted from the amount of import as there given, the object in constructing those tables having been that of showing what was the *power of consumption* resulting from the *power of production*, not that which resulted from the impoverishing system of buying goods on credit.

The average import of yarn into the other protected country, the *Zollverein*, from 1837 to 1841, was 351,000 quintals. That of 1843 was 475,000, and the average from 1840 to 1844 was probably about 440,000. In 1845 it was 574,000. Taking that as the average from 1845 to 1849, as it appears to have been,\* we have an excess of 134,000 cwts. of yarn, equal to 40,000 bales of raw cotton.

The two together make 75,000, which, being deducted from the excess consumption alleged to have taken place, leave 112,000, and the account will now stand thus . . . 1840-44 annual average 1,290,000  
1845-49 " " 1,402,000

showing an increase of little more than *eight* per cent., while the low prices of the second period have been lower than those of the first by *twenty-five* per cent. It is obvious that the increase, trivial as it has been, among the *unprotected consumers*, has been obtained at the cost of the planter, and that the amount collected from the population of England and that of the world at large for his use, was greatly less in the second period than in the first. The consumption of American cotton in Great Britain, in the present year, is estimated at only about 1,100,000 bales, being little more than it was ten years since, when the average price was as high as at present. It is clear from this the market of England cannot be made to grow in such manner as to keep pace with our production. Why it cannot, and will not, may, I think, readily be shown by an examination of the operations of the past year, in which there has existed no railroad speculation, no famine, no potato-rot, and in which, on the contrary, every thing has tended to produce a perfect realization of the anticipations of the most sanguine friend of the existing system.

The total value of exports of the kingdom for the ten months ending November 5, 1849, was . . . £49,400,000

The total of grain, and flour and meal as grain, imported in the same period, was 10,300,000 quarters, which, at an average of 36s. per quarter, would amount to about £18,500,000, and with 43,000 tons of potatoes, to about 18,600,000

The number of oxen, bulls, cows, sheep, &c., 144,000, say 150,000

Of bacon, beef, pork, hams, butter, cheese, and lard, 1,500,000 cwts., which at 30s. would be . . . 2,250,000

Grand total of commodities now imported, but with which the people of the United Kingdom supplied themselves almost entirely only a few years since . £21,000,000

Deducting these, the amount of exports remains . . . 28,400,000

The exports of cotton manufactures and yarn (£5,833,000) amounted to £22,550,000, and if we estimate the cotton required for their production at three-eighths of this amount, we obtain as its value . . . 8,500,000

The wool imported to be manufactured and exported amount-

\* The export of yarn to the ports through which Germany is supplied, in four of those years was as follows:—

	1845.	1846.	1847.	1848.
Belgium, lbs. . .	3,917,000	5,359,000	3,520,000	3,168,000
Holland " . .	21,556,000	24,662,000	16,206,000	18,877,000
Hanse Towns, &c. .	40,315,000	45,041,000	36,123,000	32,910,000
Total lbs. . .	64,788,000	75,062,000	55,849,000	54,955,000

ed to nearly 60,000,000 of pounds, which, at a shilling a pound, would be . . . . . 3,000,000

The flax imported was 1,553,000 cwts., and the average price being 32s., the amount is . . . . . 2,500,000

If we now add for the hides, timber, copper ores, Swedish iron, block-tin, brimstone, indigo and other dye-stuffs, silk, sugar, gold, silver, quicksilver, and other foreign materials included in this vast amount of manufactures exported only . . . . . 2,500,000

We obtain as the total of foreign raw materials exported . . . £16,500,000  
leaving as the value of the products of the labour and land of England exported in ten months . . . . . £11,900,000  
or per annum . . . . . £14,280,000

being at the rate of  $9/6 = \$2.28$  per head, to be applied to the purchase of cotton, sugar, coffee, tea, silks, dying materials, timber, and all other articles of necessity or of luxury required for domestic consumption, grain, potatoes, live animals, and cured provisions alone excepted.

If the reader will now compare this statement with those of other years before given,\* he will, I think, have no difficulty in satisfying himself that "the power of purchase" of the people of Great Britain is in a state of rapid diminution, and that to that fact is due the distress existing among her people.

It will be said, however, that she *does* consume much more than this amount. She does, and how she is enabled to do it, I propose now to show. Thus far, however, the accounts of the various periods are made out precisely alike, and answer for the purpose of comparing the present with the past.

It will be seen that the prices of all the articles I have particularized would be low even here. Of the grain, nearly three-fourths are wheat or wheat flour, and the price is but 4s. or 88 cents per bushel, delivered in England. The bacon, beef, pork, lard, and butter are at  $6\frac{1}{4}$  cents per pound, also delivered in England. The flax is at seven cents per pound. The wool is at a shilling, and the cotton supposed to be about  $5\frac{1}{2}d.$  per pound. These are prices at which we should not desire to deliver the same commodities at New York or Philadelphia, on their way to Liverpool. Nevertheless, Great Britain obtains all these, and immense quantities of other commodities in addition, *and yet brings us largely in debt on the year's business.* She uses sugar valued at £5,000,000. Large quantities of cotton, silk, hemp, and hides, are consumed at home. Her consumption of tea is 40 millions of pounds. Of timber she consumes a million of loads, and the price of Canada red pine is £3 per load. How does she acquire the power to do all these things?

The cotton that comes from Bombay, as stated above, frequently yields to the shipper at that place but a penny per pound, which will not defray the cost of transportation from the place of production to the place of shipment, leaving nothing whatever for the cost of production, and yet the poor producer pays to the Company heavy taxes for the use of that land, which taxes are remitted to England for the payment of expenses, pensions, dividends, &c.

The sugar from the Mauritius sells for 22s. per cwt., or  $2\frac{3}{4}d.$  per pound, a price that cannot yield the shipper much, if any thing, more than a penny per pound. The producer receives almost nothing. It was shown by the accounts of several large houses, owners of real estate in that island, that for years the estates received nothing whatever. So is it with Canada, and her lumber.

\* See page 57.



The charges upon all commodities that pass into England are immense, and they cannot be otherwise. The producers are few, and the consumers are many, and the latter must be supported by the former. Wherever four families must eat and but one raises food, the share that falls to the former must be small, and therefore it is that the farmers and planters of the world are kept so poor.

With every step downward the operation of the system tends to become more severe. A penny taken out of a pound of cotton that sells for a shilling, is a trifle, but a penny out of 3*d.* falls heavily. When cotton is high, it sells rapidly and the charges are few. When the crop is large and it sells slowly, the charges are numerous. So is it with sugar, tobacco, rice, and all other of the products of the earth. With the diminishing power of consumption prices universally have diminished, while the necessity for advances, storage, &c., has increased, giving to the exchanger power to take for himself not only a larger *proportion*, but a larger *quantity* than before. Hence it is that Great Britain is enabled to consume so much while producing so little.

Diminish her power of taxing the planters and farmers of the world, and it will speedily be seen that the power of consumption that even now exists results from the ability to throw upon others the burden that she should bear alone. The *Economist*, a journal not to be suspected of exaggerating the evils of the present state of things, expresses its belief that "the power of purchase" on the part of the British community *is not nearly equal to what it was in 1845*.\* That such is the case there can be no doubt, and that the

---

\* This same journal *but a fortnight before* assured its readers that "ever since there had been a reduction of the duties of the sliding scale, and a probability that the corn laws would be abolished, the farmers have steadily improved their cultivation and produced more." If production has increased, how is it that the power of purchase has decreased? If the power of purchase has decreased, how are the people enabled to purchase all this *supposed* increased domestic product, and the enormous quantity that is imported? The power of consumption and that of production go hand in hand with each other, and if "the power of purchase" has diminished, as it unquestionably has, it is because the power of producing things *with which to purchase* has declined.

Much of the diminution in the "power of purchase" is ascribed to the railroad speculation, but it is difficult to see how that should have produced any such effect. Under it much property changed hands, but the actual expenditure was merely the cost of grading and laying the roads, and it cannot be doubted that the labour that has been saved by means of the use of the roads has been quite equal to the amount expended. The price paid for land, and the fees to parliamentary agents, &c., were merely transfers from the pocket of one man to that of another, and could not have impaired the "power of purchase." The railroad speculation produced the roads, and existing as they do, they tend to increase the power of production and consumption. It is necessary, therefore, to look elsewhere for the causes of the state of things now existing in England. They are to be found in the *necessity* for competing with the lowest priced and most worthless labour of the world. The results of that necessity are exhibited in the following facts, which will not only account for the present diminution in "the power of purchase," but relieve us from difficulty in accounting for future diminutions.

"It appears from a parliamentary return, that the holders of farms, who in 1845 were 310,000 over the Emerald Isle, have in 1848 sunk to 108,000. *Two hundred and two thousand cultivators of land* have disappeared in three years, and with them at least half of the capital by means of which the land was made to produce any thing."—*Blackwood's Magazine*, December, 1849. The bank-note circulation of Ireland, which in August, 1846, was £7,500,000, had fallen in August, 1849, to £3,833,000.—*Ibid.* The poor rate of Ireland, which in 1846 was £200,000, has risen to £1,900,000. That of Scotland has risen in three years from £185,000 to £560,000. In Glasgow, anterior to 1846, it was £30,000. In 1848-9, it was £200,000. The number of paupers in 1845-6, was 7,454. In 1847-8, 51,852. The railroad tolls of 1845 averaged £2,640 per mile. In 1849, £1,780.—*Ibid.*

power of purchase must continue to diminish with further diminution in the power of production, is quite certain.

We see that, notwithstanding low prices for grain, the imports are immense, averaging more than nine millions of our bushels per month. Will this continue? In answer, the domestic crop of this year has not failed, nor have there been any reasons why the export from the grain-producing countries of the world should be larger than usual. We are assured that Russia can supply fifty millions of quarters annually, and that much of it is now wasted for want of a market. She has now a market, *and so long as a bushel of wheat will yield to the producer the price of a yard of cotton cloth, he will accept even that rather than waste it.* We are assured that he cannot afford to raise it at any such price, but what else can he do? Deprived of other employment for his time, he must raise food for himself, and with the surplus purchase clothing, even if he have to starve himself to obtain the little that he wears. The error of English writers consists in assuming that there is such a thing as a necessary price. The poor labourer in India, we are assured by this same writer, obtains for his cotton no more than *the mere rent of his land*, leaving nothing for his labour, yet he still cultivates cotton to exchange for the yard of cloth with which he covers his loins.

The people of England first inflicted upon themselves a *necessity* for competing with the "cheap" labour of India in the manufacture of cottons. That produced a *necessity* for competition with the "cheap" labour of Russia in the production of food, the consequences of which are thus described in the recent quarterly report of the Registrar-general:—"The population of England has *suffered, died, and decreased, during the quarter, to a degree of which there is no example in the present century.*" Emigration has gone on so rapidly, and so much in advance of immigration, that "England has now less inhabitants by several thousand than were within her shores at midsummer."

The system tends to increase man's *necessities* and to diminish his *power*. It is here shown how enormous was the difference in the prices of cotton in the two periods, and we may now look to see whether the price of cloth and iron changed therewith. From 1840 to 1844, the average price of a piece of gray cotton cloth was 6s. 7d.; from 1845 to 1849, it was above 6s. Here is a reduction of ten per cent. to set off against changes of 40 per cent. The average price of iron in 1845, 1846, and 1847, was 50 per cent. higher than that of the four previous years; and thus, while the cotton was lower than before, the thing which, of all others, the producer of cotton desires to use, was vastly higher. He was steadily giving more and receiving less, and it is no matter of surprise that his power of production diminished and his condition steadily deteriorated.

To this it is due that the power to pay for cotton cloth on the part of the people subjected to the system is steadily diminishing, and that "the consumption cannot be maintained." Nothing, "we are assured, but the stimulus of low prices" will enable "the existing markets" to take off the produce of the machinery of England; and, to secure a supply at low prices, every English writer on the subject is looking for what is called "cheap labour." That of the Zooloos may be had at 10s. per month, and Natal is advantageously situated for maintaining "competition with the States."

The "practical deduction pointed to by these facts," and that which most interests the planter, is that there must be "a check to the increase of mills and machinery," until "the increased supply of the raw material" shall bring down the price of cotton to the level of the powers of the consumers, or until "the power of purchase" shall rise to a level with the existing prices. That the latter, among the *unprotected* communities of the world, has

steadily declined, during a long series of years, is obvious, and there exists no reason for supposing that the future will be different from the past. The only remaining mode of "restoring the balance" is that of reducing cotton to the level of a *constantly diminishing "power of purchase."*

That it will be so diminished, unless the planters can determine to help themselves, there can be no doubt. The men who have heretofore raised sugar and coffee are now about to turn their attention to cotton, as likely to be more profitable than either. The people of Jamaica have been forced to abandon coffee, and sugar cannot, as their journals inform us, be any longer profitably cultivated. Why it cannot, the *Economist* informs us.

The same number, from which the above long extract is made, informs us that the sugar market is "drooping," the "expectation of a large additional consumption not having been realized." The consequence is seen in the fact, that the sugar of the distant Isle of France is quoted at 22*s.* 5*d.* per cwt., being two and two-fifth pence per pound, yielding to the shipper, after paying freight and charges, about as much as the cotton above stated to have been shipped from Bombay, to wit, one penny, and to the producer, on his plantation, but little more than is necessary to pay his rent. Under such circumstances, the labour of the people of the Mauritius becomes "cheaper," and may ultimately become as "cheap" as that of the Zooloos.

Thus is it everywhere. The late cotton planter of Alabama is trying sugar, and the sugar planter of Jamaica is determined to try cotton, under an impression that "a sufficient supply is not yet raised to meet the demand which exists for the article." The real cause of difficulty is, that the cotton planter and his neighbours are unable to obtain one-third as much sugar as they would desire to consume, and the sugar planter is unable to obtain one-third as much cloth as he would desire to consume, because the cost of both *in labour* is so greatly enhanced by the necessity for making their exchanges in the distant market of England. Were both determined to make a market on the land for the products of the land, each would obtain in return for the same quantity of labour thrice as much as now; whereas, if they continue to maintain the monopoly system of England, they must obtain even less than now, little as it is. Among the planters of the world, there is perfect harmony of interests, and those of all are to be promoted by the adoption of a system that shall tend to raise the value of labour, thereby enabling the man of Ireland, who now consumes one pound of cotton, to become the man of America, consuming a dozen or twenty pounds.

The object of every effort at maintaining in existence this great monopoly of machinery is that of preventing increase in the value of labour and land throughout the world, that commodities may be had "cheap." How great is the power exercised for this purpose, will readily be seen by all who study the sliding-scale system, by which consumption is diminished with any small advance of price, and the tendency upwards thus counteracted. The existing consumption can be maintained only at the present minimum prices, and the reason why it can only be so maintained is, that "cheap" cotton and "cheap" sugar make the *labour-cost* of cloth and iron so great that the poor cultivator of those "cheap" things cannot afford to purchase either. Dear as is the cloth to the consumers, and little as the cotton has yielded to its producers, the manufacturers have, we are assured, been working at a loss during nearly all those five years, and the profits are set down at only 1½*d.* per pound in 1845, designated by Messrs. Rathbone, in their circular accompanying the diagram given at page 75, as one of "enormous profits to manufacturers." The differences in the prices of both cotton and yarn as here given, from those given by Messrs. R., are sometimes remarkable. The cost of converting a pound of cotton into yarn No. 40, is also remarkable, and must embrace



many allowances for wear and tear, management, &c. A mill in this neighbourhood, at work upon No. 35, converts *into cloth* above a million of pounds, with the labour of 300 persons. The average wages of England are under 30*l.* per head, and this would give 9000*l.*, or about two millions of pence, *for wages of labour* required for converting a million of pounds into cloth, or two pence per pound. Notwithstanding this unceasing succession of losses, there has been, as we are assured, a constant increase of machinery for doing the work, while the whole increase of consumption is trifling. It is difficult to reconcile these statements.

Less difficult is it to ascertain what is the policy of the planter. *It is to break down the monopoly and bring the machinery of England to the cotton fields*, and there it will come whenever the producers of food and cotton shall declare to the world that it is their fixed policy *to extend the consumption of cotton by enabling themselves to supply it cheaply to the consumers*, a work that is to be accomplished by freeing themselves from the control of those who now live, and move, and have their being, by means of standing between the producer and the consumer, impoverishing the one so that he cannot continue to produce, and the other so that he cannot continue to consume.

It cannot fail to strike the reader as singular, that the clever writer of this article supposes that the system which destroys cultivation in India and Brazil has no such effect in this country. He assumes that we produce all we can, whereas we *know* that the great object throughout the South is to limit production, and that the producers are perpetually flying from lands that have been exhausted to seek new ones to be again exhausted, and wasting on the road more labour than would add to the crop hundreds of thousands of bales.

Had the planters eight years since determined that the loom *should* come to the cotton, the crop of this year would exceed three millions, and the price would be higher than it is now with one of two millions; for we should ourselves be consuming much more than a million, the purchasers of which would be found among prosperous makers of iron, who would be producing 1200 or 1500 thousand tons to be applied to the making of roads for the use of prosperous farmers and equally prosperous miners and manufacturers. Increase of price thus produced increases consumption, *and such is the tendency of protection*. Increase of price resulting from short crops tends to diminish consumption, and *such is the tendency of the monopoly system*. It destroys both the power to produce and the power to consume.

## CHAPTER SEVENTEENTH.

### HOW PROTECTION AFFECTS THE CURRENCY.

If protection be "a war upon labour and capital," it must tend to produce those disturbances of the currency that tend so greatly to diminish the return to both. If, on the contrary, it be a peaceful measure of resistance to a system tending to the oppression of the labourers and capitalists of the world, then it must tend to produce that steadiness of the currency so desirable to all, labourer and mechanic, farmer and planter, ship-owner and merchant.

The real currency of the world consists of labour and the things for which men are willing to give labour, food, clothing, fuel, iron, &c. That which is usually denominated "currency," is merely the standard by which their respective values are measured. The labourer sells the exertions of a week for five dollars, and he receives in return five bushels of wheat, also valued at five dollars. The capitalist sells a house for twenty thousand dollars, and orders the purchase of a quantity of shares of stock which, measured by the same standard, are found to be the equivalent of that number of dollars.

The price of wheat changes with the size of the crop. So does that of

sugar. If the supply of wheat be large, and that of sugar small, much wheat will be given for little sugar.

The introduction of a third commodity, itself liable to variation in the supply, as is the case with money, tends to produce additional variations in the quantity of one commodity that must be given for another. Thus, if the supply of money be large among one set of wheat raisers, and small among another, the raiser of sugar will sell in the first and buy in the last, obtaining much money from the one and giving little to the other.

Were all arrangements for the production, purchase, or sale of commodities or property executed on the instant, this cause of disturbance would scarcely exist, because the prices of all would be similarly affected, being high when money was plenty, and low when it was scarce, and the quantity of sugar to be given for wheat, or wheat for sugar, would depend upon the size of the crops almost as completely as if no intermediate commodity were used. Such, however, is not the case. The merchant buys coffee in January, and contracts to deliver its equivalent in money in July, at which time money may be so scarce that six pounds of coffee will command no more than would have been done in January by four pounds. The merchant commences to build a ship in July, when money is scarce and the price of labour is low, and he finishes it when money is plenty and wages are high, and it costs him ten, fifteen, or twenty per cent. more than he had calculated upon. The little trader, on the contrary, who buys and sells from day to day, loses nothing. If he buys high he sells high, and if prices are low to buy, he makes them low to sell, and the measure of his business is the measure of his profits.

The great sufferers by such variations are those the nature of whose property, or the character of whose business, requires them to make arrangements far ahead, and to take the risks incident to changes in the currency for the whole period that elapses between the commencement and the conclusion of an undertaking. Such are all the persons the products of whose labour are not intended for immediate consumption—the owners of houses, farms, factories, furnaces, railroads—all, in fact, connected with the improvement of land. In a time of pressure for money in one place, flour, cotton, cloth, and other articles intended for daily consumption, may be transferred to other places where money is plenty, and the changes in their prices are therefore small when compared with those which are experienced by the possessors of property that cannot be transferred, and is therefore obliged to bear the whole burden of the change. In such cases land becomes entirely unsaleable except at an enormous reduction of price, to which its owners must submit if they are placed in a position to render sales necessary, and thus it is that so many persons connected with land and its improvement are ruined by revulsions that affect but in a slight degree the operations of the retail grocer.

Such, likewise, is the case with labour. The man who has a family and finds no demand for his labour cannot change his locality. He and his family must suffer together. Food may be at a *low money-price*, but if he can obtain no employment, *the labour-price* is so high that he cannot purchase it. Land and labour, then, are specially interested in the maintenance of uniformity in the standard by which the products of both are measured, because they are the great sufferers by the changes which occur in the progress of time.

Time and distance are, in this respect, the equivalents of each other. The man who builds a house calculates upon the continuance, during the period of its erection, of the state of things that existed at its commencement, and he who remits to China to purchase teas, bases his calculations on the state of affairs that existed in that country three months previously. If money in

the mean time has become more abundant, he may pay higher for his teas than he had calculated upon, and if before their arrival it becomes less abundant here, he will obtain less, and thus will reap loss instead of profit. The man who raises cotton when he might have raised sugar or wheat, bases his calculations on the state of affairs that he supposes will exist in a foreign country, and is thus forced to superadd the risks of distance to those of time. If he exchanged his products with his neighbour, both would be subject to the same variations, so far as the currency was concerned. If money were less abundant, flour, sugar, pork, cloth, and iron would feel its effects precisely as cotton felt them, and though he might obtain less money, he would have precisely the same quantity of the commodities for the purchase of which he required to have money. The proximity of the consumer and the producer tends, then, to lessen the difficulties resulting from changes in the currency by which land and labour are always the chief sufferers.

The object of the colonial system was that of compelling the farmers and planters of the world to make their exchanges in a distant market, and thus to *increase the time* within which such risk must be borne, *adding thereto* all those which result from *distance*. When the Hindoo exchanged his cotton on the spot for cloth, the prices of cotton, cloth, and labour were governed by the same circumstances, for the exchanges were made on the instant. To make his exchanges now, two years' time are required, and he is, during all that period, subject to the risk of changes like those which have marked the years 1847 and 1848. His pursuit is rendered one of mere gambling, without the advantage of holding his own cards, although bound to pay the losses.

All the losses he and his fellow-planters *do pay*, as will be seen by those who will study out the working of the system. The cotton, the wool, the sugar, and the food of the world are sent to England for exchange. Her people buy and sell on the instant, the time that is required to elapse between the purchase of the wool and the sale of the yarn not exceeding a single week. If yarn fall, so does cotton. If cotton rise, so does yarn. The whole loss from changes of currency resulting from time and distance is thus thrown upon the planter. The whole gain resulting from the diminution of the risks of both goes to the proprietor of the small and easily transported spindle, the cost of which is as nothing when compared with the cost of the great machine required for producing the wool.

The nation that thus desires to compel all the other nations of the world to bring to her their products, that they may there be measured by her standard, ought to be able to show that it is one the length, or the contents, of which must, under any and every circumstance, remain unchanged. The standard of weight and that of length are fixed and unchangeable. So should be that of value. Far, otherwise, however, is it. The control of that great and important standard for the measurement of the values of the world is placed in the hands of the bank of England, the directors of which have proved their utter incompetency for the important business delegated to them by bringing the institution, at four different periods within the last thirty years, within the jaws of bankruptcy. Their object is to make large dividends, and, to accomplish that object, money is, as it is called, made plenty; that is, the directors overtrade largely, and thus block up the capital of individuals who find themselves compelled to take from the bank evidences of debt (certificates of deposit) not bearing interest, when they would have preferred other evidences bearing interest, and would have obtained them at reasonable prices had not the bank commenced to overtrade. With every increase of this indebtedness, called deposits, the bank considers itself richer and overtrades further, until at length speculation is produced, railroads are made, ships and houses are built, and then the day of settlement



arrives, when the bank crushes everybody in the effort to save itself. The standard of value shrinks to half, and the owner of fixed property finds himself ruined, while the planter obtains threepence where he had looked for sixpence, and the farmer is brought in debt for charges on his food where he had looked to realize a dollar a bushel.

The man of England, who buys cotton and sells yarn or cloth, suffers little from those changes. On the appearance of the first sign of change, he shortens his hours of work, or diminishes the number of his hands, and then, when the time for it arrives, he closes his mill. His work-people are thus, in whole or in part, deprived of wages, and rendered unable to purchase food or clothing, the consequence of which is diminished demand and reduced prices for both, and thus are all the losses thrown upon the farmers and planters of the world, who are ruined by the necessity for dependence on a country which desires to establish for itself a monopoly of machinery for the supply of iron and for the conversion of wool into cloth, with all of which they might supply themselves *at less cost than is now imposed upon them in each and every year.*

---

It is usual to attribute the disasters of the period from 1836 to 1842 to derangements in our currency, proceeding from erroneous action at home; but those who examine more carefully will find that they were themselves effects resulting from other causes, as I propose now to show.

It is usual to talk of capital as money; but money is only the standard by which commodities are measured, and a very small quantity of the one suffices to measure a large quantity of the other. The same dollar may be used a thousand times in a week, each time acting as the standard by which labour, flour, cotton, sugar, &c., have been measured. The man who has sold a cargo of sugar has acquired a credit with somebody by aid of which he may obtain a cargo of flour. The borrower from a bank has acquired a credit which he transfers to his neighbour, and that neighbour transfers it to a third, who divides it among his workmen, and by its aid they obtain food, clothing, and shelter.

Whenever the daily demand for labour and its products is equal to the daily supply, the rate of interest, or the price of capital seeking investment, will remain stationary, to the great advantage of the owners of landed and other fixed capital. Whenever, by reason of any cause whatever, the daily demand is less than the daily supply, the accumulation of unemployed capital begins. There are fewer houses built, and the consequence is, that there is less demand for labour, the price of which falls, and the power to consume food and clothing is diminished. The demand for iron and cotton is lessened, and furnaces and mills cease to be built, and the power to consume food and clothing is thus still further diminished. With each step in this progress, there is a tendency to the accumulation of unproductive capital. One man has it in the form of iron, another in that of cloth, a third in that of labour, and a fourth has it in the form of a debt due to him by a bank which pays him no interest. By degrees the iron and cloth pass off to be consumed, and, as their owners do not desire to reinvest the proceeds, they take a further credit on the bank, which still pays no interest. In this manner capital is blocked up, deposits accumulate, the rate of interest necessarily falls, and the prices of existing securities rise.

With this rise comes a desire to create more investments similar to those which still continue to pay interest, and there is a rush to seize on those supposed to possess greater advantages than others. Speculation begins, and prices run up rapidly. Having reached the zenith, the downward course begins. Thenceforward the progress is rapid, and fortunes disappear in a mo-

ment, leaving not even "a wreck behind." The capitalist, after having been for a long time deprived of interest, now loses the capital itself.

By the laws of 1832 and 1833, railroad iron, French merchandise generally, linens, and other commodities, were freed from duty. Some descriptions of woollen manufactures were reduced to ten per cent., and a general reduction was established, commencing in 1833, and increasing biennially thereafter, until there should be reached a uniform rate of 20 per cent.

The passage of these laws diminished the demand for capital to be employed in the making of iron. As they came gradually into action, there was a diminution in the tendency to build mills. In place of producing iron and cloth, we bought them on credit. Capital accumulated, and the prices of dividend-paying stocks rose. Next, companies were established for making railroads, and States made roads and canals, for which the iron and cloth were bought on credit. The difficulty of employing capital in the East caused it to seek investment in the South and South-west, there to be employed in the making of banks and roads, and there to be sunk for ever. The day of payment came. The iron and cloth had been used, and the certificates of debt given in exchange for it were abroad. The banks were heavily in debt to the persons whose capital had accumulated in their hands, and not being able to pay they had to stop, and thus commenced a period the most disastrous to the labourers and the owners of capital fixed in land, houses, and roads, that the country has ever seen.

An examination of the tables I have furnished will show that, during this period, the productive power of the country was stationary. Capital was in demand for distant speculation, but for little else. Houses, ships, factories, mills, furnaces, and all other of the modes of investment by which value is given to land, felt the effect equally, and thus, while the labourer suffered in the diminution of wages, the land-holder suffered in the diminished value of land. Had the roads and canals of 1835 to 1839 been based upon home-made cloth and iron, they would have produced unmixed good; but being made with *borrowed* cloth and *borrowed* iron, they were accompanied by a general deterioration of condition throughout the community, resulting in the disgrace of bankruptcy and repudiation.

By those who will trouble themselves to look below the surface, it will readily be seen that the state of things here described is precisely that now existing, and that the process at present going on is the same that brought ruin eight years since. Companies obtain large quantities of English iron upon securities that would not be received in this country, and when the day of defalcation shall come, as come it must, the cry of American bankruptcy will be as rife throughout Europe as it was but five years since. Scarcely a week elapses that does not bring with it a notice like the following, *and yet the quantity of iron consumed is less than when it was produced at home, and paid for in labour that is now being wasted.*

"The agent who went to England, to purchase iron for the Great-Western Railroad of Illinois, has returned in the Cambria, with proposals to furnish the whole quantity required for the road from Cairo to Chicago, receiving in payment the six per cent. sterling bonds of the Company, payable in London."

Capital is said to be abundant, and interest is low—for those who have unquestionable securities. The reason is, that the natural outlets for capital are closed.\* Iron is superabundant, and furnaces are not built. Coal is superabundant, and mines are not opened. Cotton cloth is superabundant, and mills are not built. Ships are superabundant, and the building of ships,

---

\* It would be nearly impossible to find a mode of investment tending to produce demand for labour, in which capital could be profitably employed, and hence it is that there is so universal a demand for bank charters.

brigs, and schooners, is diminished. We are buying on credit the cloth and iron we should be making, while the labour and capital that should be employed in their production seek in vain for employment. The heavy sufferers are, and are to be, labour and land. The broker takes his usual shave for the notes which pass through his hands, and the grocer charges his usual cent per pound on sugar, but the furnace is closed, and with it the demand for food and labour—the mine is abandoned, and the miner suffers from want of clothing—the constructor of railroads obtains no dividend, and the desire to make roads as an investment of capital has passed away, and with it the demand for labour, food, and clothing. By degrees, the same results must be experienced by every interest of the nation. The return to labour is diminishing, and the value of land, houses, ships, railroads, and every other species of property, is dependent on the extent of that return—rising as it rises, and falling as it falls.

The nearer the consumer and the producer can be brought to each other, the more perfectly will be the adjustment of production and consumption, the more steady will be the currency, and the higher will be the value of land and labour. The object of protection is to accomplish all these objects, by bringing the loom and the anvil to take their natural places by the side of the plough and the harrow, thus making a market on the land for the products of the land.

Of all the commodities in use by man, there are none that contribute so little to his comfort or convenience as gold and silver. They are useless for the clearing or draining of lands, the building of houses or mills, or the construction of ships or railroads. They can be neither eaten, drunken, nor to any extent worn. Nevertheless, of all they are the two whose arrival and departure are most carefully chronicled.

Ten furnaces and rolling-mills, capable of producing in a year three millions of dollars' worth of iron, may close without producing even a passing remark from a newspaper, but no vessel can arrive or depart, with fifty thousand dollars in gold, without the arrival being noticed in half the papers of the Union.

The factitious importance thus given to the precious metals is one of the effects of the colonial system, which demands that all the commodities of the world shall be brought to one market, there to be submitted to one standard. Its effects at home have been to make every man a seller of almost all he produces, and a buyer of almost all he consumes.\* “In our social system,” says the accomplished traveller, Mr. Laing,† “every man buys all he sells, and sells all he produces. The very bread of our labourers,” he continues, “is often bought at the manufacturer’s shop.” The system has converted a large portion of the little occupants into hired labourers, receiving from six to nine shillings a week,‡ and occupying poor houses in poor villages, where

---

\* “The evil of our economical system is, that too many of us live by wages. When masters suffer, the servant starves. When wages stop, he has nothing to fall back upon. When he would eat, he has every thing to buy—and, wages stopped, where has he to buy with? But the seed-time and harvest of the spade husbandman never fail him. He may lose a crop, but something is still left. When the slug takes his patch of wheat, he can kill him, or thrust in cabbages, or barley, or vetches, or something. The cow will yield her milk, whether ports are open, or discounts are raised. Take labour out of the market, and wages rise—the great body of consumers possess better means of payment, and manufacturers and tradesmen flourish by cheap food and better wages. The farmer is relieved in his rates, and the landlord gets a better rent for his land.”—*The Mother Country*, by Sidney Smith.

† Notes of a Traveller, page 152, American edition.

‡ See pages 113—117, ante.



they are compelled to waste much of the time that would, under a different one, be employed with infinite advantage to themselves and others.\*

The man who exchanges directly with his neighbour food and labour for coal or iron, has little need of money. He exchanges labour for labour, and if the account do not adjust itself, it is frequently balanced by the transfer of the difference to the credit of another, and thus is there established in every community in which men combine their exertions, a sort of *clearing house*, quite as effective in its operations as the celebrated one of London.†

The man who sends his cotton to Liverpool or Lowell, trades altogether for money. He desires to know how much gold he can have for a bale, and how much iron he can have for a pound of gold. He uses machinery with which the others can dispense.

Whatever tends to increase the quantity of machinery required for the accomplishment of a given effect, tends to increase the friction and augment the power required for its accomplishment. Such is the case here. The *necessity* for using gold tends to introduce a new and powerful cause of disturbance in the operations of the planter, and greatly to augment the cost of them, thus increasing the friction and diminishing the effect. Gold and silver are reduced in weight by abrasion, and *for all this loss the producer and the consumer pay*. The exchanger pays nothing. He lives at their cost.

Twenty-five years since, we thought much of gold or silver, for we were

---

\* "One principal cause of the extraordinary productiveness of land, under the management of small occupiers, is, that all or most of the cultivators are directly interested in the success of their labour; they work for themselves, and consequently with an ardour which cannot be expected from hired labourers. Every farmer might, however, make his servants almost equally zealous in his cause by altering the mode of remunerating them. If, instead of being paid a fixed rate of wages, they were entitled to a certain proportion of the crops, they would strive to make the crops as abundant as possible. \* \* \* Nothing more is wanting to cure over-population than to make people comfortable, and to make the continuance of their comforts dependent on themselves."—*Thornton on Over-population*.

† Such are "the protective societies" established in New England, in which workmen supply themselves with the various commodities required for their consumption. They desire to dispense as much as possible with the services of the exchanger, as common sense would teach all men to do. I take the following paragraph, illustrative of this movement, from one of the journals of the day:—

"Mr. Kaulback, the purchasing agent of the several protective unions in New England, has paid for the purchase of goods for the quarter ending January 1, 1850, the sum of \$102,000, being an increase of some \$23,000 over the previous three months. This is an important branch of trade that has recently grown up among us, the more so as it is a cash business, no credit in any case ever being asked for. There are now in active operation 109 union cash stores in New England, nearly all stocked by the above-named agent."—*Boston paper*.

One of the most remarkable cases of combination of action is now going the rounds of the newspapers. Captain Geo. Kimball determined to build a ship in a remote district of Maine, and there, "alone, a company of one, without capital, in a forest, at a distance even from deep water, he commenced his noble enterprise. He was soon joined by a single man, in a few weeks others followed; women contributed provisions, and the farmers sent in cattle which were exchanged for materials for ship-building. The novelty of the undertaking attracted adventurers from a distance, and experienced ship-builders and joiners arrived to give their strength and skill to the work. All who aided in the enterprise, whether men, women, or children, received their proportionate share in the ship. In April last the work was commenced, and in November she was launched, a splendid ship of more than six hundred tons burden, and christened the 'California Packet.' She is now in Boston with her passengers on board, those who built and own her, and to whom she is now a home. We need not say that the men and women who compose this company are specimens of our New England population, to whom we can refer with pride."—*Boston Transcript*.

then obliged to export them. Under the tariff of 1828, we imported them, and then they were little the subjects of thought. Under the Compromise, there came a demand for so much coin that we became bankrupt, and then came a rage for gold. Under the tariff of 1842, we imported much gold, and the idea ceased to occupy the public mind. Under the tariff of 1846, we have exported much, and have run largely in debt, preparatory to a demand for gold. When that shall come, it will again be sought for as it was in 1842.

Among the evidences of the wastefulness of the existing system may be found the rage for increasing the number of places at which gold is to be weighed and marked—called mints. The mint neither adds to the quantity nor improves the quality of the thing that is minted, and yet it is now proposed to spend six or eight hundred thousand dollars in making an addition to the number of buildings in which this work is to be performed, although there are now far more than are needed for the work that is to be done. The object in view is the saving of freight and interest. Were the government to receive bullion in New York, paying for it at full price, and then to transport it at its own cost back and forth, the freight and interest would not amount to half as much as the salaries of the officers, and were the same capital applied to the building of furnaces, it would erect as many as would produce as much iron as would pay for more than half the gold and silver coined in the year 1848, the amount of which was \$4,450,000. It is time that the planters and farmers of the Union should look to these matters for themselves, for they it is that have to suffer by the waste of capital.

Striking evidence of the diminishing power of the people of Great Britain and Ireland to obtain the comforts and conveniences of life, may be found in the following statement of the quantity of gold and silver plate, including, of course, spoons, forks, and other articles of daily use, stamped at the following periods :

Year.	Population.	Gold-plate ounces.	Silver-plate ounces.	Value of bullion per head.
1801—10	17,000,000	5,471	1,015,147	6½ cents.
1810—29	21,000,000	6,926	1,209,616	6½ “
1839—47	28,000,000	7,011	1,118,550	4.45 “

The last thirty years have witnessed the passage of a series of laws tending to compel the people to use more gold and silver; yet, with the extension of the system, their ability to be customers to the men who mine those metals has declined almost one-third. The market of the miner is diminishing as well as that of the planter.

With the diminution of the *necessities* of man there is a constant increase of his *powers*. The furnace and the mill diminish his necessity for going to the distant market, while giving him roads by which to seek it at his pleasure. The ship brings immigrants to eat the food and wear the cotton, and the freight received from them tends largely to diminish the cost of sending food and cotton to distant lands. So is it with gold. The nearer the consumer and producer can be brought together, the less is the *necessity* for it, and the greater the *power* of obtaining it. The tendency of the tariff of 1846 is to increase the *necessity* for it and diminish the *power* of obtaining it, because it tends to diminish the value of both land and labour.

## CHAPTER EIGHTEENTH.

## HOW PROTECTION AFFECTS THE FRIENDS OF PEACE.

THE more spades and ploughs employed, the larger is the return to labour. The more perfectly peace is maintained, the greater is the number of persons who may employ themselves with spades and ploughs, the more rapid must be the increase of production, and the larger must be the reward of the labourer and the capitalist.

The more swords and muskets employed, the smaller must be the return to labour. The more wars are made, the greater must be the number of persons employing swords and muskets, the slower must be the increase of production, and the smaller must be the reward of the labourer and the capitalist.

Protection is said to be a "war upon labour and capital." If it be so, it must tend to promote war. We are urged to adopt measures for maintaining *the monopoly system* of England, and are assured that, by doing so, we shall contribute to the establishment of peace. To prove that such would be the effect, it would be necessary to show that the colonial system had heretofore tended to the accomplishment of that great end.

If, however, we examine what has been the cause of most of the wars of the last hundred and fifty years, we shall find that it has been the desire for the possession of colonies whose people could be made "customers," and thus taxed for the support of the country that ruled over them. France had Canada, and she desired the country west of the Mississippi; she had islands in the West Indies, and she wanted more. England had some and wanted more. France and England were both in India, and, to settle the question which should tax the whole, that country was desolated by the march of contending armies during a long series of years. France had colonies to lose, and hence the war of 1793. France wanted colonies in the Mediterranean, and hence the rupture of the peace of Amiens, and the series of wars that closed with Waterloo. Since that time we have had a succession of wars in India for the extension of British power over Ceylon, Siam, Afghanistan, Scinde, and the Punjaub. The chief object of the war with China was that of compelling her to open her ports to foreign commerce, and it was accounted a righteous enterprise thus to compel the poor Chinese to open their eyes to the blessings of free trade. At the Cape, the war with the Caffres has cost millions. France, not to be outdone, seized on Tahiti, and deposed its poor queen; and at this moment makes war on the poor Sandwich Islanders, because they will not permit her to do with brandy as England in China did with opium. One portion of the English nation sells powder to the people of Africa, to enable them to carry on wars in which they make prisoners, who are sold as slaves, while another portion watches the coast to see that the slaves shall not be transferred to Cuba or Brazil. The anxiety for colonies has caused the waste of hundreds of thousands of lives, and hundreds of millions on the worthless Algeria. Thus everywhere it is the same; everywhere the anxiety for trade is seen stimulating nations to measures tending to the impoverishment and destruction of their fellow-men.

The power to make war depends upon the high or low valuation of man. Russia makes war readily, because men are cheap. France supports large armies at small cost. The East India Company's army consists of many hundred thousand men. Men in India are cheap. Belgium supports but a small army, because men are more valuable. England is weighed down by her fleets and armies, because wages are higher than on the continent, and she is therefore compelled to depend on voluntary enlistment. Could the price of men be raised, she would be compelled to dispense with fleets and



armies, and the necessity for colonies would cease to exist. Throughout the world, armies have been large where men were held of small account, and throughout they have tended to become less valuable as armies became more numerous.

The cause of war is to be found in the diminished or diminishing productiveness of labour, as our own experience shows. The increasing difficulty of obtaining the means of support, from 1835 to 1842, produced the dispersion of men that led to the war in Florida, the occupation of Texas and Oregon, the difficulty with Great Britain, the war with Mexico, and the occupation of California; and this latter is now leading us into discussions with Great Britain about the rights of the Mosquito king, which, but for the dispersion to California, would interest us little more than would those of the King of Bantam. The colonial system is with us, as with all, the avenue to war, because it tends to diminish the value of labour and land.

When we look to the internal condition of those nations that, from an anxiety for "ships, colonies, and commerce," have been always engaged in wars, we find it a scene of universal discord. Louis Philippe maintained fleets and armies, engaged at one time in the subjugation of Algeria, and at others in the seizure of Tahiti, and in similar enterprises elsewhere. The unproductive class increased in numbers, and the burden to be borne by the productive class increased in weight until the explosion of 1848, followed by barricades of towns, and by a series of disturbances producing a necessity for increasing still further the number of unproductive consumers, men carrying muskets, required to secure the maintenance of internal peace. England maintains large fleets and armies for the protection of commerce and colonies, and her whole empire is "a scene of rude commotion." At home, we see her chartists attempting revolution; in Ireland, monster meetings and efforts at separation, followed by appeals to arms; in Canada, efforts at revolution, followed by the present determination to effect peaceable separation; in the West Indies, universal discord among the employers and the employed; in India, perpetual difficulties, and everywhere a necessity for maintaining large armies for the purpose of maintaining internal peace, or, in other words, for preventing those who have property from being plundered by those who have it not, and enabling those who are strong to tax those who are weak.

With the gradual diminution in the productive power of the people of England, we see an increase of discord between the employers and the employed; strikes becoming more numerous, and accompanied by more serious results, the destruction of buildings and machinery being added to the injury resulting from long suspensions of labour. In Scotland, the population of whole districts is expelled to make way for sheep, while other districts present to view outrages similar to those exhibited in the lands further South. In Ireland, we see a scene of almost universal war, the land-holder in one place expelling his tenants and destroying their houses, while in thousands of others tenants are seen carrying off and secreting their crops, to avoid the payment of rent.

If we look at home, we see similar events resulting from every attempt to throw down the barrier of protection and assimilate our system to that which has produced the ruin of the British colonies. At no period of our history has there prevailed such universal discord among employers and employed as during the last few years of the Compromise act. The productiveness of labour was, as we have seen, gradually diminishing, and the employers were unable to pay to the employed such wages as would enable them to obtain the same amount of conveniences and comforts as they had before enjoyed. The year that has now closed has been signalized by the same state of things

throughout the coal region, as labour became less productive. At one time we have had turn-outs among coal operators, and at another among miners and labourers, and the result has been that the year has been one of almost total loss.

If we compare with this the period that elapsed between 1844 and 1847, we see in the latter a steady increase in the productive power, attended by an increasing tendency to harmony among employers and employed, the natural result of improvement of condition.

The exhaustion resulting from the maintenance of the colonial system thus produces a tendency to turbulence and radicalism that compels the maintenance of armies, followed by further exhaustion, and all the injurious results are borne by labour and land. Consumption cannot exceed production, and whatever decreases the proportion which hands to produce bear to mouths to be fed and backs to be clothed, diminishes the share of food and clothing that falls to each. England now raises almost seventy millions of taxes, very many of which are required for the payment of those employed in the work of collecting the remaining millions that are paid into the treasury. To these millions raised by the State must now be added eight millions for the support of one-ninth of the population of England who are paupers, and many more for the support of the paupers of Ireland. Here is a burden of above four hundred millions of dollars, the whole weight of which is to be borne by the labour and land of England and of the world, and ultimately by her land alone. The people can fly, but the land cannot. The power to pay rent depends upon the power to make the land produce, and, as that increases with increase of numbers, and improvement in the physical, moral, and intellectual condition of the labourer, it diminishes with diminution of numbers and deterioration of condition. In the three years ending with 1845, the consumption of spirits, domestic and colonial, amounted to . . . . . 23,422,295 galls. In the three years ending in 1848, it was . . . . . 25,326,861\* “ showing a tendency to inebriation increasing with the diminishing power to obtain in return for labour a suitable reward.

Demoralization produces pauperism, and pauperism increases demoralization, and the inebriate paupers must be supported out of the products of the land. The surplus food of Russia has diminished cultivation in Ireland, and has, of course, diminished production. England is now overrun with Irish labourers and paupers, and what has happened in Ireland must follow in England. More corn will continue to be imported, and more cotton goods will be exported; but the products of the land, out of which rent and taxes are to be paid, will diminish, and, while the mouths to be fed will increase in number, the food with which they are to be fed will continue to diminish in quantity. The corn-laws constituted the barrier of the land-holders of England against the effects of the system by which England was deteriorating the value of labour and land throughout the world. Their abolition tends to bring it daily more and more upon themselves, and the only remedy is to be found in the abolition of the colonial system and the suppression of the fleets and armies which its existence renders necessary. The diminution of unproductive consumers will be attended by an increase of productive ones, and the exports of England will then again represent home-grown food, to be returned in sugar, tea, coffee, and cotton, and with every step in that direction the necessity for taxes will diminish, and the power to pay them will increase.

If we look at home, we see a tendency to increase in the necessity for taxa-

---

\* This fact is adduced by the *Edinburgh Review*, July, 1849, as one of the evidences of the advantage resulting from free trade.

tion with every step towards subjection to the colonial system, and diminished tendency thereto as we move in the opposite direction. The expenses of the government under the administration of Mr. Monroe averaged thirteen millions. Those of the administration of Mr. Adams averaged little over twelve millions. During the existence of the tariff of 1828, and in the early period of the Compromise, we find the expenditure maintained at thirteen millions, but with the gradual dispersion of population we arrive at the Florida war, and an expenditure of thirty, thirty-seven, and thirty-three millions in three successive years, and afterwards falling gradually until we find it at twenty millions in the period of 1843 to 1844. With the adoption of free-trade doctrines, we find an increasing tendency to war, and the expenditure rising to sixty millions. Looking at all these facts, it is difficult to arrive at any other conclusion than that protection tends to increase the demand for spades and ploughs, and the reward of labour, and to diminish that demand for swords and muskets which leads to the destruction of both the labourer and the plough. The friend of peace is therefore directly interested in the destruction of the English monopoly of machinery.

If protection be a war upon labour and capital, we should find it attended with diminished production and increased expenditures. If, on the contrary, it be, as its name imports, protection to both labourer and capitalist, tending to augment the value of the labourer, then it should be attended with increased production and diminished expenditure. We have now before us the fact, that, while the government, from 1824 to 1833, was administered at about one dollar per head, the cost of administration rose in the free-trade period to more than two dollars, to fall again to one in the period of protection, and to rise to almost three in the present free-trade one.\* Protection looks homeward. Free trade, under existing circumstances, looks abroad, and needs fleets and armies, with hosts of officers, great custom-houses and warehouses, branch mints in California and New York, ministers plenipotentiary and chargés without number abroad, and hosts of officers at home, to be supported out of the proceeds of labour and land. The one looks to cheap and good government; the other to a splendid one, profitable to the governors, but fatal to the governed.

We have seen that under protection the value of labour at home has increased, and that therewith there has been an increase in the power of consuming foreign commodities, such as we do not ourselves produce. We have also seen that while it tends to increase the importation of people from abroad, it tends likewise to facilitate the transmission to Europe of our bulky commodities, by enabling us to send them at almost nominal freights, and that thus, while it raises the value of labour throughout the world by diminishing the number of persons seeking employment, it also raises it by enabling those who remain abroad to obtain sugar, cotton, coffee, and the other productions of the West, at diminished cost. The way to promote harmony among nations, and in the bosom of nations, is to increase the value of man, and such has been, and must continue to be the result of protection. That object once accomplished, all necessity for custom-houses, whether for protection or for revenue, will cease.

---

The man who contributes to the support of war makes war, and if he does it voluntarily he is accountable for the results thereof in the deterioration and

---

\* Independently of the amount of money paid for the expenses of the Mexican war and the purchase of California, ninety thousand land warrants have been issued to soldiers who served in the war, giving to them as bounty 13,800,000 acres. Estimating this land at the government price, \$1 25 an acre, we have an aggregate of \$17,230,000.



destruction of his fellow-men. Of all the people of the world, there are none who have contributed so largely as ourselves to the maintenance of the fleets and armies by which Ireland has been ruined, and war has been carried throughout Europe and Asia. So far as we have done this voluntarily, we are as much responsible for the destruction of life and property in China, Scinde, Afghanistan, and the Punjaub, as the men by whose command these things were done.

We have seen that England produces little to export, yet is she enabled to consume much. The producer obtains little for his cotton, yet the labourer obtains little clothing for the time employed in converting the cotton into cloth. The sugar-planter obtains little iron for his sugar, yet the miner has little sugar for his labour. The tobacco-grower has little cloth for his product, but the spinner can consume little tobacco. The reason for all this is to be found in the fact that between the consumer and the producer stands a host of exchangers, the greatest of which is that which collects taxes to be paid out for the support of fleets and armies. Every pound of cotton that travels on an English railway, contributes its proportion to the £108,000 of taxes paid by the single London and North-western railway, the £68,000 paid by the Great Western,\* or some other of the immense sums paid by other railways. Every pound of tobacco pays 3s.=72 cents, towards the maintenance of the fleets and armies of Great Britain, in addition to its share of the taxes on warehouses, bills of exchange, promissory notes, and of the thousand other taxes paid by the various persons who stand between the producer and the consumer. These men produce nothing themselves, and their taxes must be paid for them by the land and labour that do produce—whether it be foreign or domestic.

England is now the great war-making power of the world. It is by means of the monopoly of machinery for the production of iron, and for the conversion of cotton into cloth, that she is enabled to tax the world for the maintenance of her fleets and armies,† for the prosecution of those wars. To destroy her power to make war would be to bring about peace. Protection tends to limit her power to tax the farmers and planters of the world, and thus to limit her power to raise revenue for the payment of soldiers and sailors, while it tends to raise the value of man, and thus make soldiers and sailors more costly. In both ways it tends to diminish the power to maintain fleets and armies, and to promote the maintenance of peace. Every friend of peace is therefore bound to use his efforts for the destruction of *the monopoly system*.

The London *Times* recently published, with approbation, a letter from the East Indies—from a British officer engaged in the battle of Goodjerat, from which the following is an extract. It is deserving the careful consideration of every man who has heretofore aided in the maintenance of the system:—

“The enemy were in the sands trying to escape, and our men *knocking them over like dogs*. . . Some of our men screamed out, ‘They are off!’ Fordyce’s troops went off at a gallop, our men giving them three cheers—such cheers—*it was a perfect scream of delight and eagerness!* and you may be sure I assisted and yelled till I was hoarse! . . . Every wounded Sikh was either shot or bayoneted (!) . . . I rushed up with a few of the grenadiers, and found four men re-loading their pieces; three were bayoneted, and I was *hacking away at the head of the fourth*, when Compton, of the grenadiers, shot him. The

\* North British Review, August, 1849.

† Sir Charles Napier has addressed a letter to the public, which fills five closely printed columns of the *Times*, upon the subject of the navy and its expenses. The sum and substance of what he says seems to be, “that we have spent about ninety millions sterling during the last twenty-eight years in rebuilding our navy twice over, and now we cannot even find the fragments.” Such are the results of the system of “ships, colonies, and commerce.”

last shot was fired at an unfortunate Goorer in the camp, who was seated quietly reading their Grunth! . . . We waited at this place about two hours; and I can assure you they were about the *jolliest two hours* I ever passed. I never enjoyed a bottle of beer so much in all my life!"

## CHAPTER NINETEENTH.

### HOW PROTECTION AFFECTS THE EXCHANGER.

THE exchanger stands between the producer and the consumer. He himself produces nothing, although consuming much, in exchange for which he gives only services. He buys a bale of cloth and divides it among the consumers, giving a piece to one and a yard to another, but he makes no change in the quantity or quality of the commodities that pass through his hands. The bale of cloth would clothe as many men, and the cargo of flour would feed as many, without his services, as with them. Nevertheless, the exchanger takes rank before the producer. The merchants of London, of New York, and of Boston, have more influence over the action of government, and over public opinion, than twenty, fifty, or even one hundred times the number of men whose every hour is given to increasing the quantity and improving the quality of things necessary to the use of man.

The reason that such is the case is that the present system of trade tends to increase the *necessities* of the producers for going to distant markets, and to diminish their *power* so to do. When the producer of iron takes his place by the side of his producer of food, the latter exchanges his potatoes, his cabbages, his veal, his milk, and his butter, directly with the former, and obtains his iron at little cost of labour. He is thereby enabled to improve his wagon and his roads, and to go to market cheaply, thus increasing his powers while diminishing his necessities. The more distant the consumer and the producer, the greater must be the quantity of machinery of exchange, and the poorer must be its quality, and every such change in regard to either tends to the impoverishment of the farmer and planter.

Such being the case, it might be supposed that here was a case of discord. The exchangers would suffer by the adoption of measures tending to bring the consumers to take their places by each other. Directly the reverse, however, is the fact. The quantity to be exchanged depends on the extent of the *surplus* that is produced, and that increases with prodigious rapidity as the power of production is increased. The man who produces no more food than is absolutely necessary for his own consumption, has nothing to exchange for cloth or iron. Once fed, he may exchange the whole surplus, whatever it be, and therefore it is that the amount of exchanges increases with such wonderful rapidity when production increases, as was the case from 1843 to 1847.

The larger the return to labour applied to production, the less must be the necessity for seeking employment in the work of exchange, and the less will be the competition in trade. Our cities are filled with young men from the country who would have remained at home among parents and friends, had the cotton or woollens factory, the furnace or the rolling-mill, been there to give them employment; but as it was not there, they have been compelled to add themselves to the already almost infinite number of clerks, hoping, and vainly hoping, to obtain stores or shops for themselves. By bringing the consumer to the side of the producer, such young men would, in future, remain at home to swell the number of producers, and to increase the amount of production, enabling each exchanger to perform a larger amount of business, and to grow rich with the same rate of commission that now keeps him poor

It is asserted that of all the persons engaged in trade, in our cities, four-fifths fail. The cause is to be found in the fact that so many are forced into trade, for want of being enabled to apply themselves to production, and that when there they are exposed to the effects of the enormous changes which result from the existence of the English monopoly system. Iron sells at one time at ten pounds, and soon after at five. The man of small capital, who has a stock on hand, is ruined. Cottons and woollens change in like manner. At one moment England desires to sell iron and cloth in exchange for certificates of debt, and money is said to be plenty. At the next, she asks to be paid, and money becomes scarce. The little capitalist is ruined by the change. The consequence is, that our cities are filled with men who have adventured in trade, and failed.

In England, these disastrous effects are far more widely felt. The country is filled with young men anxious to be employed in any department of trade, for in the work of production can be found no demand for time or mind, unless accompanied with large capital. The consequence is a perpetual strife for obtaining even the means of subsistence, among shopmen, clerks, and journeymen,\* while the unceasing changes carry ruin, at brief intervals, among the employers. The last three years have seen to disappear a large number of the principal trading firms in the kingdom, and the exhibits they have made of their affairs afford proof conclusive of the ruinous character of the system. In Liverpool, at one time, there were 7000 houses and stores unoccupied. What had become of those who had been their occupants?

The tendency of the whole system is to produce a *necessity* for trade, and to diminish the *power* to maintain trade. "Commerce," there, "is king," and like other kings, he is exhausting his own subjects. Having plundered and ruined India, the West Indies, Ireland, Portugal, and all other countries subject to his control, he is now doing the same at home. With every step he is diminishing the power of applying labour to production, and increasing the necessity for looking to trade as the only means of employing time, talent, or capital, with constantly decreasing return to all; and hence it is that so large a portion of the people of the United Kingdom desire to escape to other lands, where Commerce, finding in agriculture and manufactures his equals, cannot be king. In his proper place he is most useful, but as master he has always proved a tyrant worse than any recorded even in the annals of Rome. The object of the colonial system was that of making him master, and its effects are now felt at home as well as abroad. The object of protection is to put an end to his tyranny, and to bring him back to his true condition; and among the whole people there are none whose interests are more to be promoted by the accomplishment of that object than those who are now engaged in commerce, because with every step it will increase the amount of exchanges to be performed, without a corresponding increase in the number of exchangers.

---

\* "Fourteen hundred tailors are now in London totally unemployed, and hundreds daily applying for relief to the houses of call; the funds are, however, exhausted. Nine hundred shoemakers out of work have their names on the books, and seventeen hundred are working for half wages. The curriers and leather-dressers are in the same situation. There were never known so many working jewellers out of employ, and meetings of the trade are now holding to petition parliament for protection against the competition of foreign labour."—*Morning Post*.



## CHAPTER TWENTIETH.

## HOW PROTECTION AFFECTS WOMAN.

WITH every increase in the value of labour and land, the condition of woman is improved. With every improvement in her condition, she has more leisure to devote to the care of her children, and to fitting them worthily to fill their station in society, giving value to labour and land. If protection be "a war upon labour and capital," it must tend to diminution in the value of labour and land, and to deterioration in the condition of the weaker sex. How far that is the case we may now examine.

Throughout a large portion of this country, the time of women is almost entirely valueless. They would gladly work if they could, but there is no employment but that on the farm, for which they are not fitted. Place in every county of the Union a mill, and there will thus be produced a demand for that now surplus labour, and the workers in the mill will obtain more and better food and clothing, and they will be able to obtain more and better clothing, and education, and books by which to improve their minds, and fit them to fill the station of mothers, to which they will then be called. For want of local employment the young men are forced to seek the cities, or to fly to the West, and thousands and tens of thousands of women remain at home unmarried, while other thousands also seek the cities in search of employment, and terminate their career as prostitutes, because unable to compete with the "cheap" labour of the unhappy subjects of the following article, which I take from one of the newspapers of the day:—

"The distressed needle-women of London have been made the object of a commission of inquiry instituted by the Morning Chronicle. Three gentlemen well known in literature have examined the state of this unfortunate class, and the result is, that there lives in London a body of about 33,000 women permanently at the starvation point; working at the wages of a few pence a day.

"The greater portion of these poor creatures, living, as they do, far beyond the social state, resort to prostitution, as a means of eking out their miserable subsistence; whenever the pressure threatens their extinction, then they turn into the street, and pauperism runs into inevitable vice. Since the disclosures of the Morning Chronicle, many humane persons have forwarded considerable sums of money to the office of that journal for distribution among the most necessitous objects; and Mr. Sidney Herbert has come forward to found a society for promoting their emigration. There is something like half a million of women in excess of men in Great Britain; there is a corresponding excess of males in the British Australian Colonies. The society above mentioned aims to bring these marriageable parties in contact; and it is hoped, that when once it is in operation, government will assist it with funds. It costs some £15 to transport a passenger to Australia. Now, if private benevolence raises a sum of £30,000, this will only relieve 2000 of the sufferers: a mere fraction, whose absence would not be sensible in the metropolis. It would require ten times that amount to lade out the misery to the proper extent, and also to satisfy the wants of the colonists."

"Commerce is king," and such are his female subjects. To the same level must fall all those who are under the *necessity* of competing with them, and such are even now the results of the approach to the system that looks to the maintenance of the English monopoly as being freedom of trade. The compensation for female labour is miserably small, even now, but it must fall far lower when we shall be called upon to settle the account for the modicum of iron, wool, silk, and earthenware that we receive in exchange for all our cotton, tobacco, rice, flour, pork, cheese, butter, *and evidences of debt*.

"So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them. And God blessed them and said

unto them, Be fruitful and multiply, and replenish the earth and subdue it."

Such was the first command of God to man on earth, and, as he does or does not comply with it, he is found a moral or immoral being. If the association of man with his fellow-man tend to the elevation of character and to the promotion of civilization, how infinitely more is such the result of that intimate association resulting from obedience to the command, "Be fruitful and multiply." The relation of husband and wife, and that of parent and child, are both essential to the development of all that is good and kind, gentle and thoughtful. The desire to provide for the wife and the child prompts the husband to labour, for the purpose of acquiring the means of present support, and to economy as a means of preparation for the future. The desire to provide for the husband and the children prompts the wife to exertions that would otherwise have been deemed impossible, and to sacrifices that none but a wife or a mother could make.

The modern school of political economy says, "Be not fruitful; do not multiply. Population tends to increase faster than food." It prescribes disobedience to the earliest of God's commands. Obedience thereto, in those who are poor, is denounced as improvidence; and to those who are so improvident as to marry, "with no provision for the future, no sure and ample support even for the present," it is thought "important to pronounce distinctly that, on no principle of social right or justice, have they any claim to share the earnings or the savings of their more prudent, more energetic, more self-denying fellow-citizens."\* To have a wife for whom to labour, and with whom to enjoy the fruits of labour, is a luxury, abstinence from which is placed high among the virtues. To have children to develop all the kindly and provident feelings of the parents, is a crime worthy of punishment. Charity is denounced as tending to promote the growth of population. To rent land at less than the full price, is an error, because it tends to increase the number to be fed. To clear the land of thousands whose ancestors have lived and died on the spot, is "improvement." Cottage allotments are but places for breeding paupers.

Southey denounced the Byronian school of poetry as "satanic," and so may we fairly do with the school of political economy that has grown out of the colonial system, and the desire to make of England "the work-shop of the world." It teaches every thing but Christianity, and that any feelings of kindness towards those who are so unfortunate as to be poor should still remain in England, is due to the fact that those who teach it have not in their doctrine sufficient faith to practise what they preach.

The direct tendency of the existing monopoly of machinery which it is the object of *free trade* to maintain, is towards barbarism. It drives hundreds of thousands of Englishmen to abandon mothers, wives, and sisters, and barbarize themselves in the wilderness, while of those who remain behind a large portion are too poor to marry, the consequences of which are seen in the immense extent of prostitution and the perpetual occurrence of child murder. In this country it is the same. Of the almost hundreds of thousands of men who have fled to the wilds of Oregon or California, a vast portion would have remained at home with mothers and sisters had the consumer been allowed to take his place by the side of the producer, as he would long since have done, but for the existence of this most unnatural system.

Among the women of the world, there is a perfect harmony of interests. It is to the interest of all that the condition of all should be elevated, and such must be the result of an increase in the value of labour. The object

\* Edinburgh Review, October, 1849.

of protection is that of raising throughout the world the value of man, and thus improving the condition of woman. Every woman, therefore, who has at heart the elevation of her fellow-women throughout the world, should advocate the cause of protection.

## CHAPTER TWENTY-FIRST.

### HOW PROTECTION AFFECTS MORALS.

THE moral man is sensible of the duties he owes to his wife, his children, society, and himself. He frequents neither taverns nor gaming-houses. His place is home.

The more perfect the morality the more productive will be the labour of a community, and the greater will be the power of its members to improve their moral and intellectual condition. If protection be "a war upon labour and capital," it must tend to the deterioration of morality and the diminution of the reward of labour.

The more equal the division of a community between the sexes, the greater will be the power to contract matrimony, and the higher will be morality. The monopoly system tends to expel the men and produce inequality in the number of the sexes, and thus to diminish the power to contract matrimony, thereby producing a tendency to immorality. The object of protection is to enable men to remain at home, and thus bring about equality, which cannot exist where the tendency to dispersion exists.

The more men can remain at home, the better they can perform their duties to their children. The monopoly system tends to compel them to perform their exchanges in distant markets and to separate themselves from wives and children. The object of protection is to bring the consumer to take his place by the side of the producer, and enable them to effect their exchanges at home.

The more directly the consumer exchanges with the producer, the less will be the disposition and the power to commit frauds. The farmer of Illinois has no object in adulterating his corn, because corn is cheap; but the miller of England mixes beans with the corn, because corn is dear. The planter of Alabama would gain nothing by substituting flour for cotton, because the latter is cheap; but the manufacturer of England does so because cotton is dear. The coffee planter delivers coffee. The English shopkeeper substitutes chicory for coffee, because the latter is dear. The inducement to fraud in these cases results from the distance between the producer and the consumer, which it is the object of protection to diminish. The shoemaker makes good shoes for his customers; but he makes indifferent ones for the traders who deal with persons that are distant. The gunsmith furnishes to his neighbours guns that will stand the proof; but when he makes others to be sold in Africa, he cares little if they burst at the first fire. The necessity for maintaining the monopoly of machinery now enjoyed by England leads to frauds and forgeries of every description, with a view to displace the foreign produce and deceive the foreign producer.\* The power to commit

---

\* As a specimen of this, I take the following from one of the journals of the day:

"We are surprised to see gingham in market, sent out from England by the house of A. & S. Henry & Co. of Manchester, imitating the above goods in patterns, width, and style of finish. But a most palpable and unfair imitation is in the label, where, preserving the same general appearances as to size, colour of paper and ornaments, the word *Lancasterian* is substituted for *Lancaster*. That the whole is a manifest and intentional counterfeit, there cannot be a doubt. The goods will, undoubtedly, be sold for American Lancaster gingham, to which they are inferior in fineness of fabric and permanency of colour, to the manifest injury of the profits and reputation of the American manufacturer  
- Boston paper.



frauds thus results from the distance between the consumer and the producer. Protection looks to bringing them near together, and thus diminishing that power.

The planter who exchanges on the spot with the iron-master and the miller, makes large crops and grows rich, and the gain resulting from successful frauds would be trifling compared with the loss of character. The one who is distant from both makes small crops, which are sensibly increased in amount by the substitution of stones in lieu of cotton or tobacco. The *inducement* to commit frauds here results from the distance between the consumer and the producer, and is diminished as the loom and the anvil come nearer to the plough and the harrow.

The man who makes his exchanges in distant markets spends much time on the road and in taverns, and is liable to be led into dissipation. The more he can effect his exchanges at home, the less is the danger of any such result. The object of the monopoly system is that of compelling him to effect all his exchanges at a distance, and to employ for that purpose numerous wagoners, porters, sailors, and other persons, most of whom have scarcely any home except the tavern.

The more uniform the standard of value, the less does trade resemble gambling. The object of the monopoly system is to subject the produce of the world to a standard of the most variable kind, and to render agriculture, manufactures, and trade, mere gambling. The object of protection is to withdraw the produce of the world from that standard, enabling every community to measure the products of its labour by its own standard, giving labour for labour.

The object of the English system is to promote *centralization*, and its necessary consequence is that of compelling the dispersion of man in search of food.\* London and Liverpool, Manchester and Birmingham, have grown with vast rapidity by the same system which has exhausted Ireland, India, and the West Indies. The same journal informs us of the construction of a new town opposite Liverpool, of the great additions to London, and of the absolute necessity for promoting emigration from Ireland, Scotland, and even from England. As each successive province is exhausted, there arises a desire, and even a necessity for adding to the list. Bengal and Bombay having ceased to be productive, Afghanistan is attempted, and the Punjab is conquered. The ruin of the West Indies is followed by an invasion of China, for the purpose of compelling the Chinese to perfect freedom of trade. The Highlands are depopulated, and Australia is colonized.

Mr. Jefferson held great cities to be "great sores." He desired that the manufacturer should take his place by the side of the agriculturist—that the loom and the anvil should be in close proximity to the plough and the harrow. Mr. Jefferson looked and thought for himself. He had studied political economy before it became necessary for Mr. Malthus to invent a theory of population that should satisfactorily account for the scarcity of food under

---

\* "To those who have never reflected on the subject, it may seem like exaggeration to say that, as a general fact, at least nine-tenths of the lower orders suffer physically, morally, and intellectually, from being over-worked and under-fed; and yet I am convinced that the more the subject shall be investigated, the more deeply shall we become impressed with the truth and importance of the statement. It is true that but few persons die from direct starvation, or the absolute want of food for several successive days, but it is not the less certain that *thousands upon thousands* are annually cut off, whose lives have been greatly shortened by excess of labour and deficiency of nourishment.

\* \* It is a rare thing for a hard-working artisan to arrive at a good old age; almost all become prematurely old, and die long before the natural term of life."—*Combe's Philosophy of Digestion*.

the unnatural policy of England, and thus relieve the law-makers of that country from all charge of mis-government. He studied, too, before Mr. Ricardo had invented a theory of rent, for the maintenance of which it was necessary to prove that the poor cultivator, beginning the work of settlement, always commenced upon the rich soils—the swamps and river-bottoms—and that with the progress of population he had recourse to the poor soils of the hills, yielding a constantly diminishing return to labour—and therefore it was that he thought for himself. Modern financiers have blindly adopted the English system, based on the theories of Malthus and Ricardo, and the perfection of civilization is now held to be found in that system which shall most rapidly build up great cities, and most widely separate the manufacturer from the agriculturist. The more perfect the centralization, the greater, according to them, will be the tendency towards improvement.

Mr. Jefferson was in favour of combined action, as being that which would most tend to promote human improvement, physical, moral, intellectual, and political. That it does so, would seem to be obvious, as it is where combination of action most exists that men live best and are best instructed—commit least crimes, and think most for themselves. There, too, there exists the strongest desire to have protection.

A recent traveller\* in the United States, says that “the facility with which every people conscientiously accommodate their speculative opinions to their local and individual interests, is sufficiently demonstrated by the fact, that the several States and sections of States, “as they successively embark in the manufacture, whether of iron, cotton, or other articles, become immediately converts to protectionist views, against which they had previously declaimed.”

It is here supposed that the desire for protection results from a selfish desire to tax others, but the persons exclusively devoted to manufactures of any kind are too few in number to affect the elections, and yet wherever mills or furnaces are established, the majority of the people become advocates of the doctrine of protection, and that majority mainly consists of agriculturists,—farmers and planters. Why it is so, may be found in the fact that they experience the benefits resulting from making a market on the land for the products of the land, and desire that their neighbours may do the same. Ignorant selfishness would induce them to desire to retain for themselves the advantage they had gained. Enlightened selfishness would induce them to teach others that which they themselves had learned.

Ignorant selfishness is the characteristic of the savage. It disappears as men acquire the habit of association with their neighbour men. The proclaimed object of the monopoly system is that of producing a necessity for scattering ourselves over large surfaces, and thus increasing the difficulty of association, and the object is attained. “The prospect of heaven itself,” says Cooper, in one of his novels, “would have no charm for an American of the backwoods, if he thought there was any place further west.”

Such is the common impression. It is believed that men separate from each other because of something in their composition that tends to produce a desire for flying to wild lands, there probably to perish of fever, brought on by exposure, and certainly to leave behind them all that tends to make life desirable. Such is not the character of man anywhere. He is everywhere disposed to remain at home, when he can, and if the farmers and planters of the Union can be brought to understand their true interests, at home he will remain, and doing so, his condition and that of all around him, will be im-

---

\* Sir Charles Lyell.

proved. The habit of association is necessary to the improvement of man. With it comes the love of the good and the beautiful. "I wish," says the author of a recent agricultural address, "that we could create a general passion for gardening and horticulture. We want," he continues, "more beauty about our houses. The scenes of childhood are the memories of our future years. Let our dwellings be beautified with plants and flowers. Flowers are, in the language of a late cultivator, 'the playthings of childhood and the ornaments of the grave; they raise smiling looks to man and grateful ones to God.'"

We do want more beauty about our houses, and not only about our houses but about our minds, and that it may be obtained, we must rid ourselves of a system which makes the producer the servant of the exchanger. Such is the object of protection.

It is most truly said that "there is no friendship in trade." As now carried on, it certainly does not tend to promote kindly feelings among the human race, nor can it do so while the system remains unchanged. The great object of traders appears to be the production of discord. By so doing, England has obtained the supreme control of India. Her journals are unceasingly engaged in sowing discord among the various portions of this Union, and the effort would be successful were it not that there is no real discordance in their true interests.

It is time that the people of Great Britain should open their eyes to the fact that their progress is in the same direction in which have gone the communities of Athens, and Rome, and every other that has desired to support itself by the labour of others. It is time that they should awake to the fact that the numerous and splendid gin-shops, the perpetual recurrence of child-murder for the purpose of plundering burial societies, and the enormous increase of crime\* and pauperism, are but the natural consequence of a system that tends to drive capital from the land, to be employed in spindles and

---

\* "Humanity cries to us from the depths. If we will not answer her, it were better a millstone were tied about our necks, and that we were cast into the sea. Have we no sense of the precipice on which we stand? Have not the books of the prophetess been one by one burnt before our eyes—and does not the sybil even now knock at our doors to offer us her final volume, ere she turn from us and leave us to the Furies? Crime, not stealing, but striding onward. Murders, poisonings, becoming almost a domestic institution among our villages—husband, children, parents, drugged to their final home for the sake of the burial fees. Vice within the law, keeping pace with offence without. Incest winked at by our magistracy from its fearful frequency in our squalid peasant dwellings. Taxation reaching beyond the point at which resources can meet it, so that, at increasingly shorter intervals, we have to borrow from ourselves to make expenditure square with income. Poor Laws extended to Scotland and Ireland, where they were never known before, and new Poor Laws failing in England to check the advance of rates, and the growth of inveterate beggary, until property threatens to be swallowed up by the propertyless, and a terrible communism to be realized among us by a legalized division of the goods of those who have, among those who have not—the fearfullest socialism, the equal republic of beggary. 'Speak! strike! redress!' Three millions and a half of the houseless and homeless, the desperate, the broken, the lost, plead to you in a small still voice, yet louder than the mouthing theories of constitution-mongers. Man, abused, insulted, degraded, shows to you his social scars, his broken members, his maimed carcass, blurred in the conflict of a selfish and abused community.

"We say it must no longer be. We are a spectacle to gods and men—'a by-word and a hissing to the nations.' Savages grow up in the midst of our feather-head civilization, wilder, more forlorn, more forgotten, and neglected than the Camanches, or the earth-eaters of New Holland. Ragged foundlings, deserted infant wretchedness, paupers hereditary, boasting a beggar pedigree older than many of our nobles, grow up from year to year, generation to generation, eat with brazen front into the substance of struggling industry."—*The Mother Country, by Sydney Smith.*



ships, and labour from the healthful and inspiring pursuits of the country, to seek employment in Liverpool and Manchester, where severe labour in the effort to underwork the poor Hindoo, and drive him from his loom, is rewarded with just sufficient to keep the labourer from starving in the lanes and cellars with which those cities so much abound.

That "there is no friendship in trade," is most true, and yet trade is the deity worshipped in this school. In it "commerce is king," and yet to commerce we owe much of the existing demoralization of the world. The anxiety to sell cheap induces the manufacturer to substitute cotton for silk, and flour for cotton, and leads to frauds and adulterations of every description. Bankruptcy and loss of honour follow in the train of its perpetual revulsions. To obtain intelligence an hour beforehand of an approaching famine, and thus to be enabled to buy corn at less than it is worth, or to hear in advance of the prospect of good harvests, and to sell it at more than it is worth, is but an evidence of superior sagacity. To buy your coat in the cheapest market, careless what are the sufferings of the poor tailor, and sell your grain in the dearest, though your neighbour may be starving, is the cardinal principle of this school.

A very slight examination will suffice to convince the reader that, as has been already shown, these frauds and overreachings increase in the ratio of the distance between the consumer and the producer. The food that has travelled far is dear, and worthy to be mixed with beans. The cotton produced in remote lands is dear, and it is profitable to mix it with flour. The shoemaker who supplies the auctions uses poor leather, and employs poor workmen.\* The object of protection is that of bringing the consumer of food to the side of its producer, there to eat plenty of good and nourishing food; the consumer of cotton to the side of its producer that he may not need to wear a mixture of wool and paste; and the shoemaker to the side of the farmer and planter, that the latter may be supplied with "custom-work," and not "slop-work." By this he gains doubly. He gives less food, and gets better clothing in return. By so doing, his own physical condition and the moral condition of the shoemaker are both improved.

The whole tendency of the system is to the production of a gambling spirit. In England, it makes railroad kings, ending in railroad bankrupts, like Henry Hudson. If we could trace the effect of the great speculation of which this man was the father, we should find thousands and tens of thousands of husbands and wives, parents and children, utterly beggared to build up the fortunes of the few, and thus increase the inequality of social condition which lies at the root of all evil. If we examine it here, we see it sending tens of thousands to California, eager for gold, there to lose both health and life.† It is sending thousands of boys and girls to our cities—the former

---

\* Take, as an illustration in the system, the fraud in carpets, such as are usually sold at auction. "The head end of the piece is woven firmly for a few yards, when the web is gradually slackened, so that the inside of the piece bears no comparison with the outside. This is done so adroitly that it is impossible for any, but the best judges to tell in what the cheat consists. There is a double evil in this imposture, for the fabric not only grows poorer and thinner as the piece is unrolled, but the figures, containing of course the same number of threads throughout, will not match, their size being increased with the slackness in weaving. This is not only a positive cheat, but it greatly interferes with the honest dealer, whose goods being alike throughout, cannot of course compete in price. It is incredible to what an extent this practice is carried, and it is high time there was some legal remedy."—*Dry Goods Reporter*.

† "This is one of the strangest places in Christendom. I know many men, who were models of piety, morality, and all that sort of thing, when they first arrived here, and

to become shopmen, and the latter prostitutes, while hundreds of thousands are at the same time making their way to the West, there to begin the work of cultivation, while millions upon millions of acres in the old States remain untouched. With every step of our progress in that direction, social inequality tends to increase. The skilful speculator realizes a fortune by the same operation that ruins hundreds around him, and adds to his fortune by buying their property under the hammer of the sheriff. The wealthy manufacturer is unmoved by revulsions in the British market which sweep away his competitors, and, when the storm blows over, he is enabled to double, treble, or quadruple, his already overgrown fortune. The consequence is, that great manufacturing towns spring up in one quarter of the Union, while almost every effort to *localize* manufactures (thus bringing the loom and the anvil really to the side of the plough and the harrow) is followed by ruin. The system tends to make the rich richer and the poor poorer. The coal miner of the present year works for half wages, but the coal speculator obtains double profits, and thus is it ever—the producer is sacrificed to the exchanger. With the growth of the exchanging class, great cities rise up, filled with shops, at which men can cheaply become intoxicated. New York has 4567 places at which liquor is sold, and the *Five-Points* are peopled with the men who make Astor-place riots. Single merchants employ 160 clerks, while thousands of those who are forced into our cities and seek to obtain a living by trade are ruined. Opera singers receive large salaries paid by the contributions of men whose shirts are made by women whose wages scarcely enable them to live.

The whole system of trade, as at present conducted, and as it must continue to be conducted if the colonial system be permitted longer to exist, is one of mere gambling, and of all qualities, that which most distinguishes the gambler is ignorant selfishness. He ruins his friends and wastes his winnings on a running-horse, or on a prostitute. To what extent this has been the characteristic of the men who have figured most largely in the walks of commerce, might be determined by those who are familiar with the concerns of many of the persons described in the following passage, which I take from one of the journals of the day :

“The great merchants of this great mercantile city, who were looked up to with reverence by the mammon-worshipping crowd twenty years ago—where are they? Ask Stephen Whitney and those few who have with him survived the shock of thirty years’ changes, and they will tell you, in commercial language, that 93 or 95 per cent. of their contemporaries at that date have since become bankrupt, and that the widows of most of those deceased are either “keeping boarding-houses” or have left friendless orphans to “the tender mercies” of a commercial world.

“Look at the ephemeral creatures of this and last year’s accidents, who now figure largely in the great world of New York, whether in the wholesale or retail line—whether in commerce, fashion, theatricals or religion—and ask where and what they or their children are likely to be twenty-years hence. The answer will be such as none of those most deeply in it will be apt to give with precise or probable correctness. ‘They shall heap up riches and know not who shall gather them;’ ‘they shall build houses and know not who shall inhabit them;’ ‘they shall plant vineyards and shall not eat the fruit of them;’ they shall ‘call their lands after their own names,’ and a generation shall rise up and possess them who shall laugh those names into a contempt from which the oblivion that shall succeed will seem a happy deliverance.”—*N. Y. Herald*.

---

who are now most desperate gamblers and drunkards.”—*Extract from a letter dated San Francisco, July 30.*

“*American Lottery*—Class No. 1—\$10,000 in actual prizes, sixty-six numbers, twelve drawn ballots. Whole tickets, \$10; half do. \$5. This lottery will be drawn at the Public Institute in San Francisco, on the third day of October, ’49, at twelve o’clock, M., under the superintendence of the managers.”—*Pacific News*.

As a necessary consequence of the system, money becomes more and more an object of consideration in the contraction of the important engagement of matrimony, and marriage settlements begin to appear among us. The newspapers of the day inform us of the recent execution of one for \$200,000.

If we look westward, it is the same. Centralization produces depopulation, and that is followed by poverty and crime. London grows upon the system that ruins India and fills it with bands of plunderers. The West and South-west are filled with gamblers, and land-pirates abound. The late war has brought into existence a new species of fraud, in the counterfeiting of land-warrants, and this is but one of the many evils resulting from that measure.

If we look back but a few years, we may see that the period between 1835 and 1843 was remarkable for the existence of crime, and it was that one in which the tendency to dispersion most existed. If we now look to the period between 1843 and 1847, we can see that there was a gradual tendency to the restoration of order and quiet and morality throughout the Union. In the last year, we may see the reverse. It was marked by turnouts, insubordination and violence of various kinds in country and in city. Such is the direct consequence of a diminution in the productiveness of labour. The employer must pay less, and the employed is unwilling to receive less than that to which he has been accustomed.

The tendency of the colonial system is to increase the number of wagons and wagoners, ships and sailors, merchants and traders, the men who necessarily spend much time in hotels and taverns, living by exchanging the products of others. The tendency of protection is to increase the number of producers—of the class that lives at home, surrounded by wives, children, and friends. The one builds up the city at the expense of the country; the other causes both to grow together.

Cities are rivals for trade, and when the farmer desires a new road to market he is opposed, lest it should enable him to go more cheaply to Charleston than Savannah; to New York more readily than to Philadelphia. London is jealous of Liverpool, and Liverpool of London. Discord is everywhere, and the smaller the amount of production, the greater must it necessarily be. Protection seeks to increase production, and thus establish harmony.

It is asserted that protection tends to increase smuggling, and therefore to deteriorate morals. To determine this question, it would be required only to ascertain what description of men transact business at our custom-houses. From 1830 to 1834, the chief part was done by men who had homes occupied by wives and families, for whose sake reputation was dear, but from 1835 to 1842, it passed almost entirely into the hands of men who lived in hotels and boarding-houses, and who had neither wives nor families to maintain. From 1843 to 1847, it went back to the former class. It has now returned almost entirely into the hands of agents—men whose business is trade, and who swear to a false invoice for a commission. The honest man, who desires to perform his duties to his wife and children, to society, to his country, and to his Creator, cannot import foreign merchandise. The system is a premium on immorality and fraud.

The object of protection is the establishment of perfect free trade, by the annexation of men and of nations. Every man brought here increases the domain of free trade, and diminishes the necessity for custom-houses. Every man brought here consumes four, six, ten, or twelve pounds of cotton for one that he could consume at home, and every one is a customer to the farmer for bushels instead of gills. Between the honest and intelligent man who desires to see the establishment of *real* free-trade, the Christian who desires to see an improvement in the standard of morality, the planter who desires an in-



creased market for his cotton, the farmer who desires larger returns to his labour, the landowner who desires to see an increase in the value of his land, and the labourer who desires to sell his labour at the highest price, there is perfect harmony of interest.

## CHAPTER TWENTY-SECOND.

### HOW PROTECTION AFFECTS INTELLECTUAL CONDITION.

THE higher the degree of intellect applied to the work of production, the larger will be the return to labour, and the more rapid will be the accumulation of capital. If protection be "a war upon labour and capital," it must tend to prevent the growth of intellect.

The more men are enabled to combine their efforts, and the greater the tendency to association, the larger is the return to labour, and the more readily can they obtain books and newspapers for themselves, and schools for their children. The object of the monopoly system is that of compelling men to scatter themselves over large surfaces, and into distant colonies, and thus to diminish the power of obtaining books, newspapers and schools. The object of protection is the correction of this error, and to enable men to combine their efforts for mental as well as physical improvement.

The greater the tendency to association, the greater is the facility for the dissemination of new ideas in regard to modes of thought or action, and for obtaining aid in carrying them into practical effect. The object of the *English monopoly system* is that of separating men from each other, and depriving them of this advantage. The object of protection is to enable them to come together, and being so, it would seem to be the real friend to both labourer and capitalist.

If we look throughout the world we shall see intellect increasing as men live more and more in communion with each other, and diminishing as they are compelled to separate. The man who is distant from market spends much of his time in taverns, where he obtains little tending to the improvement of mind or morals. The man who has a market at his door, may obtain books and newspapers, and he is surrounded by skilful farmers, from whom he obtains information. Not being compelled to spend his time on the road, he is enabled to give both time and mind to the improvement of his land, to which he returns the refuse in the form of manure, and thus it is that he himself grows rich.

Of all the pursuits of man, agriculture—the work of production—is the one that most tends to the expansion of intellect. It is the great pursuit of man. There is none "in which so many of the laws of nature must be consulted and understood as in the cultivation of the earth. Every change of the season, every change even of the winds, every fall of rain, must affect some of the manifold operations of the farmer. In the improvement of our various domestic animals, some of the most abstruse principles of physiology must be consulted. Is it to be supposed that men thus called upon to study, or to observe the laws of nature, and labour in conjunction with its powers, require less of the light of the highest science than the merchant or the manufacturer?"\* It is not. It is the science that requires the greatest knowledge, and the one that pays best for it: and yet England has driven man, and wealth, and mind, into the less profitable pursuits of fashioning and exchanging the products of other lands: and has expended thousands of millions on fleets and armies to enable her to drive with foreign nations the poor trade, when her own soil offered her the richer one that tends to produce

\* Wadsworth's Address to the New York Agricultural Society

that increase of wealth and concentration of population which have in all times and in all ages given the self-protective power that requires neither fleets, nor armies, nor tax-gatherers. In her efforts to force this trade, she has driven the people of the United States to extend themselves over vast tracts of inferior land when they might more advantageously have concentrated themselves on rich ones: and she has thus delayed the progress of civilization abroad and at home. She has made it necessary for the people of grain-growing countries to rejoice in the deficiencies of her harvests, as affording them the outlet for surplus food that they could not consume, and that was sometimes abandoned on the field as not worth the cost of harvesting; instead of being enabled to rejoice in the knowledge that others were likely to be fed as abundantly as themselves. Her internal system was unsound, and her wealth gave her power to make that unsoundness a cause of disturbance to the world; and hence she has appeared to be everywhere regarded as a sort of common enemy.

To this unsound system we are indebted for the very unsound ideas that exist in regard to the division of labour. Men are crowded into large towns and cities, to labour in great shops, where the only idea ever acquired is the pointing of a needle, and that is acquired at the cost of health and life. The necessary consequence is the general inferiority of physical, moral, and mental condition, that is observable in all classes of English workmen.

Of all machines, the most costly to produce is Man, and yet the duration of this expensive and beautiful machine is reduced to an average of twenty-five or thirty years, under the vain idea that by so doing pins and needles may be obtained at less cost of labour. The principle is the same that is said to govern the planter of Cuba when he stocks his estate exclusively with males, deeming it cheaper to buy slaves than to raise them. As a necessary consequence, the duration of life is there short, and so is it in the crowded factories of the great "workshop of the world." The idea is vain. Pins and needles would be obtained at far less cost of labour were the workshops of Sheffield and of Birmingham scattered throughout the kingdom, thereby enabling the producers of pins to take their places by the side of the producers of food, and enabling all to enjoy the pure air and pure water of the village, instead of being compelled, after breathing the foul atmosphere of the workshop during the day, to retire at night to rest in the filthy cellar of the undrained street. Were the ore of Ireland converted into axes and railroad bars by aid of the coal and the labour of Ireland, the cellars of Manchester and Birmingham would not be filled with starving Irishmen, flying by hundreds of thousands from pestilence and famine, and compelling the labourers of England to fly to the United States, Canada, or Australia.

The English school of political economy treats man as a *mere* machine, placed on the earth for the purpose of producing food, cloth, iron, pins, or needles, and takes no account of him as a being capable of intellectual and moral improvement. It looks for physical power in connection with ignorance and immorality, and the result is disappointment.\* The workman of

---

\* The commissioners for inquiring into the state of education in Wales, describe a state of mental condition perfectly in keeping with the following account of their physical condition:—"The houses and cottages of the people are wretchedly bad, and akin to Irish hovels. Brick chimneys are very unusual in these cottages; those which exist are usually in the shape of large coves, the top being of basket-work. In few cottages is there more than one room, which serves for the purpose of living and sleeping." Hence it is that there is so universal a want of chastity, resulting, say the commissioners, "from the revolting habit of herding married and unmarried people of both sexes, often unconnected by relationship, in the same sleeping rooms, and often in adjoining beds, without partition or curtain." [See Westminster Review, No. XCVI]

this country is infinitely the superior of the workman of Manchester, and the reason is, that he is not treated as a mere machine. The object of what is called free trade is to degrade the one to the level of the other. The object of protection is that of enabling the poor artisan of Manchester or Leeds, Birmingham or Sheffield, to transfer himself to a country in which he will not be so treated, and in which he may have books and newspapers, and his children may be educated.

The colonial system involves an expenditure for ships of war, soldiers, and sailors, greater than would be required for giving to every child in the kingdom an education of the highest order; and those ships and men are supported out of the proceeds of taxes paid by poor mechanics and agricultural labourers, whose children grow up destitute even of the knowledge that there is a God. The object of protection is to do away with the necessity for such ships and men, and to raise the value of labour to such a point as will enable the people of England to provide schools for themselves.

In the colonies, the perpetual exhaustion of the land and its owner has forbidden, as it now forbids, the idea of intellectual improvement. To the West Indies no Englishmen went to remain. The plantations were managed by agents, and the poor blacks, under their agency, died so fast as to render necessary an annual importation merely to keep up the number. In India, where education was from the earliest period an object of interest to the government, and where every well-regulated village had its public school and its schoolmaster, in which information was so well and so cheaply taught as to furnish the idea of the Lancaster system, it has almost disappeared. In the *thana* of Nattore, containing 184,509 inhabitants, there were, a few years since, but 27 schools, with 262 scholars. The teachers were simple-minded and ignorant, with salaries of \$2.50 per month, and the scholars were without books. The number who could read and write was 6000. Such was the state of education in one of the best portions of Bengal. In the Bombay presidency, with a population of six and a half millions, there were 25 government schools, with 1315 scholars, and 1680 village schools, with 33,838 scholars. In the Madras presidency, out of 13 millions, there were 355,000 male and 8000 female scholars, and the instruction was of the worst kind.

In Upper Canada, in 1848, the number of children, male and female, under fourteen years of age, was 326,050, of whom but 80,461 attended school.\* So far the state of things is better than in other colonies; but when we come to look further, the difference is not very great. The intellect of man is to be quickened by communion with his fellow-man, of which there can be but little where the loom is widely distant from the plough, and men are distant from each other, all engaged in the single pursuit of agriculture. How slow has been the growth of concentration in that province, may be seen from the following facts. Numerous small woollen mills furnish 584,008 yards of flannel and other inferior cloths, working up the produce of perhaps 250,000 sheep. Fulling mills exist, at which about 2,000,000 pounds of woollen cloths of household manufacture are fulled. Further, there are—

1 rope-walk.	11 pail factories.	1 ship-yard.	1 vinegar factory.
1 candle factory.	1 last factory.	1 trip hammer.	5 chair factories.
1 cement mill.	4 oil mills.	2 paper mills, making	2 brick-yards.
1 sal-eratus factory.	3 tobacco factories.	1900 reams each.	1 axe factory, producing 5000 per annum.
8 soap factories.	2 steam-engine factories.	3 potteries.	6 plaster mills. †
3 nail factories.		1 comb factory.	

And these constitute the whole of the manufacturing establishments of

\* Appendix to first Report of Board of Registration.

† Ibid.



that great district of country, much of it so long settled. There is, consequently, little or no employment for mind, and the consequence is, that all who desire to engage in other pursuits than those of agriculture fly to the South. There are now within the Union, it is said, not less than 200,000 Canadians, and with every day the tendency to emigration increases.\* If we look to Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, it is the same. There is there no demand for intellect, and any man possessing it flies southward. Forty years since it was asked, "Who reads an American book?" That question has long since been answered; but it may now be repeated in reference to all the British provinces. Who reads a Canadian, a Nova-Scotian, or a New Brunswick book? Upper Canada has two paper-mills capable of producing about ten reams of paper per day, being, perhaps, a tenth of what is required to supply the newspapers of Cincinnati. Forty years since, the question might have been asked, Who uses an American machine?" and yet the machine shops of Austria and Russia are now directed by our countrymen, and the latest improvements in machinery for the conversion of wool into cloth are of American invention. The British provinces have had the *advantage* of perfect free trade with England, the consequence of which is, that they are almost destitute of paper-mills and printing-offices, and machine shops are unknown, while the Union has been a *prey to the protective system*, that "war upon labour and capital," the consequence of which is, that paper-mills and printing-offices abound to an extent unknown in the world, and almost equal in number and power to those of the whole world,† and machine shops exist almost everywhere. These differences are not due to any difference in the abundance or quality of land, for that of Upper Canada is yet to a great extent unoccupied, and is in quality inferior to none on the continent. They are not due to difference in other natural advantages, for New Brunswick has every advantage possessed by Maine and New Hampshire, and Nova Scotia has coal and iron ore more advantageously situated than any in the Union. They are not due to difference of taxation, for Great Britain has paid almost all the expenses of government. To what, then, can they be attributed, but to the fact that those provinces have been subject to the *monopoly system*, and compelled to waste their own labour while giving their *products* in exchange for the *services* of English men, women, and children, employed in doing for them what they could have better done themselves, and losing four-fifths of their products in the transit between the producer and the consumer? Place the colony within the Union—give it protection—and in a dozen years its paper-mills and its printing-offices will become numerous, and many will then read Canadian books.

In England, a large portion of the people can neither read nor write, and there is scarcely an effort to give them education. The colonial system looks to low wages, necessarily followed by an inability to devote time to intellectual improvement. Protection looks to the high wages that enable the labourer to improve his mind, and educate his children. The English child, transferred to this country, becomes an educated and responsible being. If he remain at home, he remains in brutish ignorance. To increase the

---

\* "I do not exaggerate when I say that there are no less than 200,000 Canadians in the United States; and, unless efficacious means are taken to stop this frightful emigration, before ten years two hundred thousand more of our compatriots will have carried to the American Union their arms, their intelligence, and their hearts."—*Letter of Rev. Arthur Chiniquy.*

† The whole quantity of paper required to supply the newspaper press of Great Britain and Ireland is 170,000 reams; while that required for the supply of *four papers* printed in New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore, is about 110,000, and the whole number of newspapers is about 2400.

productiveness of labour, education is necessary. Protection tends to the diffusion of education, and the elevation of the condition of the labourer.

At no period of our history has the demand for books and pictures, or the compensation of authors or artists, been less than in the period of 1842-43. At none have they grown so rapidly as from 1844 to 1847. They now tend downward, notwithstanding a demand that is still maintained by the power that yet exists of obtaining merchandise in exchange for certificates of debt. When that shall pass away, we shall see a recurrence of the events of the free trade period.

If we desire to raise the intellectual standard of man throughout the world, our object can be accomplished only by raising the value of man, as a machine, throughout the world. Every man brought here *is* raised, and every man so brought tends to diminish the supposed surplus of men elsewhere. Men come when the reward of labour is high, as they did between 1844 and 1848. They return disappointed when the reward of labour is small, as is now the case. Protection tends to increase the reward of labour, and to improve the intellectual condition of man.

### CHAPTER TWENTY-THIRD.

#### HOW PROTECTION AFFECTS THE POLITICAL CONDITION OF MAN.

THE larger the return to labour, the greater will be the power to accumulate capital. The larger the proportion which capital seeking to be employed bears to the labourers who are to employ it, the larger will be the wages of labour, the greater the power of the labourer to accumulate for himself, and the more perfect will be his control over the disposition of his labour and the application of its proceeds, whether to private or to public purposes.

The freeman chooses his employer, sells his labour, and disposes of the proceeds at his pleasure. The slave does none of these things. His master takes the produce of his labour, and returns him such portion as suits his pleasure.

Throughout the world, and in all ages, freedom has advanced with every increase in the ratio of wealth to population. When the people of England were poor, they were enslaved, but with growing wealth they have become more free. So has it been in Belgium and in France. So is it now in Russia and Germany, and so must it everywhere be. India is poor, and the many are slaves to the few. So is it in Ireland. Freedom is there unknown. The poor Irishman, limited to the labours of agriculture, desires a bit of land, and he gives the chief part of the product of his year's labour for permission to starve upon the balance, happy to be permitted to remain on payment of this enormous rent. He is the slave of the land-owner, without even the slave's right to claim of him support in case of sickness, or if, escaping from famine, he should survive to an age that deprives him of the power of labouring for his support. England employs fleets, paid for out of taxes imposed on starving Irishmen, to prevent the people of Brazil from *buying* black men, and women, and children, on the coast of Africa, while holding herself ready to *give* white men, and women, and children, to any who will carry them from her shores, and even to add thereto a portion of the cost of their transportation; and this she does without requiring the transporter to produce even the slightest evidence that they have been delivered at their destined port in "good order and well-conditioned." When Ireland shall become rich, labour will become valuable, and man will become free. When Italy was filled with prosperous communities, labour was productive, and it was in demand; and then men who had it to sell fixed the price at which it should be sold. With growing poverty, labour

ceased to be in demand, and the buyer fixed the price. The labourer then became a slave. If we follow the history of Tuscany, we can find men becoming enslaved as poverty succeeded wealth; and again may we trace them becoming more and more free, as wealth has grown with continued peace. So has it been in Egypt, and Sicily, and Spain. Everywhere poverty, or a deficiency of those aids to labour which constitute wealth, is, and has invariably been, the companion of slavery; and everywhere wealth, or an abundance of ploughs, and harrows, and horses, and cows, and oxen, and cultivated lands, and houses, and mills, is, and has invariably been the companion, and the cause, of freedom.

If protection be a "war upon labour and capital," it must tend to prevent the growth of wealth, and thus to deteriorate the political condition of man.

The farmer who exchanges his food with the man who produces iron by means of horses, wagons, canal-boats, merchants, ships, and sailors, gives much food for little iron. The iron man, who exchanges his products for food through the instrumentality of the same machinery, gives much iron for little food. The chief part of the product is swallowed up by the men who stand between, and grow rich while the producers remain poor. The growth of wealth is thus prevented, and inequality of political condition is maintained.

The farmer who exchanges directly with the producer of iron gives labour for labour. Both thus grow rich, because the class that desires to stand between has no opportunity of enriching themselves at their expense. Equality of condition is thus promoted.

The object of protection is that of bringing the consumer of food to take his place by the side of the producer of food, and thus promoting the growth of wealth and the improvement of political condition. That it does produce that effect, is obvious from the fact that, in periods of protection, such vast numbers seek our shores, and that immigration becomes stationary, or diminishes, with every approach towards that system which is usually denominated free trade.

The colonial system is based upon cheap labour. Protection seeks to increase the reward of labour. The one fills factories with children of tender years, and expels men to Canada and Australia; the other unites the men and sends the children to school.

The Irishman at home is a slave. He prays for permission to remain and pay in pounds sterling for quarters of acres, and his request is refused. Transfer him here and he becomes a freeman, choosing his employer and fixing the price of his labour. The Highlander is a slave that would gladly remain at home; but he is expelled to make room for sheep. One-ninth of the population of England are slaves to the parish beadle, eating the bread of enforced charity, and a large portion of the remaining eight-ninths are slaves to the policy which produces a constant recurrence of chills and fevers—overwork at small wages at one time, and no work at any wages at another. Transfer them here and they become freemen, selecting their employers and fixing the hours and the reward of labour. The Hindoo is a slave. His landlord's officers fix the quantity of land that he must cultivate, and the rent he must pay. He is not allowed, on payment even of the high survey assessment fixed on each field, to cultivate only those fields to which he gives the preference; his task is assigned to him, and he is constrained to occupy all such fields as are allotted to him by the revenue officers, and whether he cultivates them or not, he is saddled with the rent of all. If driven by these oppressions to fly and seek a subsistence elsewhere, he is followed wherever he goes and oppressed at discretion, or deprived of the advantages he might expect from a change of residence. If he work for wages, he is paid in money when grain is high, and in grain when it is low. He, there-



fore, has no power to determine the price of his labour. Could he be transferred here, he would be found an efficient labourer, and would consume more cotton in a week than he now does in a year, and by the change his political condition would be greatly improved.

Protection looks to the improvement of the political condition of the human race. To accomplish that object, it is needed that the value of man be raised, and that men should everywhere be placed in a condition to sell their labour to the highest bidder—to the man who will give in return the largest quantity of food, clothing, shelter, and other of the comforts of life. To enable the Hindoo to sell his labour and to fix its price, it is necessary to raise the price of his chief product, cotton. That is to be done by increasing the consumption, and that object is to be attained by diminishing the waste of labour attendant upon its transit between the producer and the consumer. Fill this country with furnaces and mills, and railroads will be made in every direction, and the consumption of cotton will speedily rise to twenty pounds per head, while millions of European labourers, mechanics, farmers, and capitalists will cross the Atlantic, and every million will be a customer for one-fourth as much as was consumed by the people of Great Britain and Ireland in 1847. The harmony of the interests of the cotton-growers throughout the world is perfect, and all the discord comes from the power of the exchangers to produce apparent discord.

It is asserted, however, that protection tends to build up a body of capitalists at the expense of the consumer, and thus produce inequality of condition. That such is the effect of *inadequate* protection is not to be doubted. So long as we continue under a *necessity* for seeking in England a market for our surplus products, her markets will fix the price for the world, and so long as we shall continue to be under a *necessity* for seeking there a small supply of cloth or iron, so long will the prices in her markets fix the price of all, and the domestic producer of cloth and iron will profit by the difference of freight both out and home. With this profit he takes the risk of ruin, which is of perpetual occurrence among the men of small capitals. Those who are already wealthy have but to stop their furnaces or mills until prices rise, and then they have the markets to themselves, for their poorer competitors have been ruined. Such is the history of many of the large fortunes accumulated by the manufacture of cloth and iron in this country, and such the almost universal history of every effort to establish manufactures south and west of New England.

Inadequate and uncertain protection benefits the farmer and planter little, while the uncertainty attending it tends to make the rich richer and the poor poorer, thus producing social and political inequality.

Adequate and certain protection, on the contrary, tends to the production of equality—first, because by its aid the *necessity* for depending on foreign markets for the sale of our products, or the supply of our wants, will be brought to an end, and thenceforth the prices, being fixed at home, will be steady, and then the smaller capitalist will be enabled to maintain competition with the larger one, with great advantage to the consumers—farmers, planters, and labourers; and, second, because its benefits will be, as they always have been, felt chiefly by the many with whom the price of labour constitutes the sole fund out of which they are to be maintained.

If we take the labour that is employed in the factories of the country, from one extremity to the other, it will be found that nearly the whole of it would be waste, if not so employed. If we take that which is employed in getting out the timber and the stone for building factories and furnaces, it will be found that a large portion of it would otherwise be waste. If we inquire into the operations of the farmer, we find that the vicinity of a factory, or

furnace, enables him to save much of the labour of transportation, and to sell many things that would otherwise be waste. Thus far, the advantage would seem to be all on the side of the employed, and not on that of the employer.

Let us now suppose that all protection were abolished, and that perfect freedom of trade were established, and that the result were, as it inevitably would be, to close every factory, furnace, rolling mill, and coal-mine in the country, and see what would be the result. The owners of such property would lose a few millions of dollars of rents, or profits, but the supply of fuel would be less by three millions of tons, that of iron would be less by eight hundred thousand tons, and that of cotton cloth would be less by almost a thousand millions of yards. The demand for the labour now employed in the production of those commodities would be at an end, and the spare-labour of men, and women, and children, and wagons, and horses, and the various things now used in and about factories and furnaces, would then be wasted, coal and iron and cloth would be doubled in price, and labour would be diminished in a corresponding degree. The power to import iron, or coal, or cloth, would not be increased by a single ton, or yard, and the people would be compelled to dispense with necessities of life that are now readily obtained. The capitalists, whose means were locked up in factories or furnaces, would suffer some loss; but the mass of persons possessed of disengaged capital, and the receivers of *State* dividends, would be able to command, for the same reward, a much larger quantity of labour than before.

The object of protection is that of securing a demand for labour, and its tendency is to produce equality of condition. The jealousy of "overgrown capitalists" has caused many changes of policy; but, so far as they have tended to the abolition of protection, they have invariably tended to the production of inequality. The wealthy capitalist suffers some loss; but he is not ruined. A change takes place, and he is ready to avail himself of it, and at once regains all that had been lost, with vast increase. The small capitalist has been swept away, and his mill is in a state of ruin. By the time he can prepare himself to recommence his business, the chance being past, he is swept away again, and perhaps for the last time.

For months past, the rate of interest on a certain species of securities has been very low. The wealthy man could borrow at four per cent.; the poor man, requiring a small loan on a second-rate security, could scarcely obtain it at any price. The man who has coal to sell, or iron to sell, must have the aid of middlemen to act as endorsers upon the paper received from his customers, and their commissions absorb the profits. The wages of the miner have been greatly reduced, while the profits of the speculator have been increased. The reason of all this is, that, throughout the nation, there prevails no confidence in the future. It is seen that we are consuming more than we produce; that our exports do not pay for our imports; that we are running in debt; that furnaces and mills are being closed; and every one knows what must be the end of such a system. Re-enact the tariff of 1842, and the trade of the middleman would be at an end, because confidence in the future would be felt from one extremity of the land to the other. Should we not find in this some evidence of the soundness of the principle upon which it was based? The system which gives confidence must be right; that which destroys it must be wrong.

Confidence in the future—Hope—gives power to individuals and communities. It is that which enables the poor man to become rich, and the character of all legislative action is to be judged by its greater or less tendency to produce this effect. A review of the measures urged upon the nation by the advocates of the system miscalled free trade, shows, almost without an exception, they have tended to the destruction of confidence, and there-

fore to the production of the political revolutions referred to in the first chapter.

The direct effect of the insecurity that has existed has been to centralize the business of manufacture in one part of the Union and in the hands of a comparatively limited number of persons—such as could afford to take large risks, in hope of realizing large profits. Had the tariff of 1828 been made the settled law of the land, the Middle and Southern States would now be studded with factories and furnaces, and while the North and East would not have been less rich, they would be far richer, and the present inequality of condition would not now exist.

The power of the North, as compared with that of the South, is due to the jealousy of the former entertained by the latter, which has prevented the establishment of a decided system, having for its object the destruction of the English monopoly, and the ultimate establishment of perfect freedom of trade.

The object of the colonial system was that of taxing the world for the maintenance of a great mercantile, manufacturing, and landed aristocracy, and the mode of accomplishment was that of securing a monopoly of machinery. The object of protection is to break down that monopoly, and with it the aristocracy that collects for the people of Great Britain and the world those immense taxes, to be appropriated to the payment of fleets and armies officered by younger sons, and kept on foot for the maintenance of the existing inequality in Great Britain, Ireland, and India. All, therefore, who desire to see improvement in the political condition of the people of the world should advocate the system which tends to break down monopoly and establish perfect freedom of trade.

#### CHAPTER TWENTY-FOURTH.

##### HOW PROTECTION AFFECTS CREDIT—INDIVIDUAL AND NATIONAL.

THE existence of credit is evidence of the existence of confidence that the man who desires to obtain for a time the use of property intends to return it. The more universal this confidence, the more readily can the capitalist place his funds, and the larger will be the return. The more universal it is, the more readily can the labourer obtain the necessary aids to labour, and the more productive will be that labour. If protection be “a war upon labour and capital,” it must tend to destroy the confidence of man in his fellow-man.

The object of protection is that of bringing the consumer to take his place by the side of the producer, exchanging labour for labour, and thus diminishing the *necessity* for credit. Its effect is to diminish the machinery of exchange, and thus to increase the productiveness of labour, and with it the *power* to obtain credit.

The object of the monopoly system is that of separating the consumer from the producer, and *compelling* both to repose confidence in distant men, thus increasing the *necessity* for credit. Its effect is that of increasing the machinery of exchange, and diminishing the productiveness of labour, and thus diminishing the *power* to obtain credit.

That such is its effect in the colonies of Great Britain, we know. In India, once so wealthy, the ordinary rate of interest is twelve per cent.; but the poor cultivator borrows seed at the rate of one hundred per cent. Credit there has no existence, and yet almost the whole exchanges of the country are made at a distance of many thousands of miles, by men in whom the consumer and producer are *compelled* to repose confidence.

In the West Indies, credit has almost entirely disappeared. In Canada,



even the government cannot effect loans without a guaranty from parliament. So is it throughout the whole range of colonies.

At home, capital is cheap, because of the want of general confidence. The capitalist takes two per cent.; but the labourer could not borrow at thirty per cent. The capitalist that owns machinery is enabled to dictate the terms upon which it shall be used by those who work. Sometimes he employs many work-people. At others few. Sometimes he works long time, and at others short time. At all times his people obtain but a small proportion of the products of labour; but at many times they obtain but a *very* small proportion, while at others they are unable to obtain the use of machinery at any price.

Abroad, the credit of English merchants is falling daily. But recently, there were in the great city of Liverpool, scarcely half a dozen houses that could be trusted with a cargo of cotton. Such are the effects of the system in which "Commerce is king," and the consumer and the producer are placed at the mercy of the exchanger.

At no period in this country did confidence grow more rapidly than in the period between 1830 and 1834. At none did it decline with such rapidity as between 1835 and 1842. With the action of the tariff of 1842, it was restored, but with that of 1846 it again declines. There is no demand for capital, and it is cheap. There is little demand for labour, and it too is cheap.

Never, probably, since the settlement of the country, did the poor man find so much difficulty in obtaining the aid of capital, as in 1842, the period of free trade. Never has he found it more easy than between 1844 and 1847. The period of distrust has again arrived. Money is said to be abundant, but the security must be undoubted, and the poor man pays two per cent. a month for the use of capital that the rich man cannot invest to produce him more than four per cent. per annum. There is no confidence existing.

"Notwithstanding the cheapness and abundance of money," says the New York Herald, "no one seems disposed to touch any thing in the way of speculation, and capitalists prefer loaning money at four per cent. interest, on good security, to purchasing stocks at present prices. They say that when they lend money on first-rate security, at a low rate of interest, they are sure of the principal and a small amount of interest, when they want it."

The re-establishment of the tariff of 1842 would restore confidence, and produce a demand for labour, and wages would rise—and a demand for capital, the price of which would also rise, and thus it would appear that in protection is to be found the harmony of interest between the labourer and the capitalist.

#### NATIONAL CREDIT.

From 1830 to 1835, the national credit grew, for we paid for what we imported. From 1835 to 1840, credit declined, for we ran largely in debt for cloth and iron, for which our exports could not pay. In 1842, national credit disappeared, for we were unable to pay even the interest on our debts. From 1843 to 1848, national credit grew, for we paid interest and commenced the reduction of the debt. In the last two years we have gone largely in debt, and must now either diminish our imports or run further into debt.

How long we can continue to do this, does not depend upon ourselves. Any circumstance producing a change in the rate of interest in Europe, would cause our certificates of debt to be returned upon us for payment, and what then would be the state of the national credit? A nation that is largely in debt is always in danger of losing its credit.

## CHAPTER TWENTY-FIFTH.

## HOW PROTECTION AFFECTS REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE.

THE more men live and work in connection with each other, the greater is their *power* to protect themselves. The more widely they are separated from each other, the greater is their *necessity* for seeking protection from others.

The more they live in connection with each other, the larger will be the product of their labour, and the greater will be their power to contribute towards the maintenance of peace and order. The less they live in connection with each other, the less productive will be their labour, and the less will be their power to contribute to that object.

With every increase in the productiveness of labour, the power of self-government thus increases, with increased power to contribute towards the expenditures incident to the maintenance of government; and with every diminution therein, the power of self-government decreases, with diminished power to contribute towards the public revenue required for paying others for performing the duties of government.

If protection be, as is asserted, a "war upon labour and capital," it must increase the necessity for government by others, and diminish the power to contribute towards its maintenance.

The object of protection is, however, that of enabling men to live in connection with each other, the consumer taking his place by the side of the producer, each protecting, and protected by, the other. This would seem to diminish the *necessity* for seeking protection from others. Another object of protection is that of enabling men to exchange with each other, giving labour for labour, without paying so many persons for standing between them. This would seem calculated to increase their power to pay for protection, should it be needed.

The object of the monopoly system—now known by the name of free trade—is that of separating the consumer from the producer, and diminishing their power to protect each other. Their exchanges are to be always made in distant markets, and many wagons, ships, and men are to stand between, for the care of which fleets and armies are needed. This would seem to increase their *necessity* for protection, while the diminished power of combination of action would seem to tend to decrease their *power* of paying for protection.

How stand the facts? The question will be answered by placing side by side the expenditures under the different systems:—

Protection.		Free trade.	
	Per annum.		Per annum.
1829 to 1834 .	\$16,800,000	1834 to 1841 .	\$31,700,000
1843 to 1845 .	20,700,000	1846 to 1849 .	44,500,000

The necessity for contributing towards the support of government seems to have increased with the approach towards free trade, and to have diminished as we approached protection.

The revenue from customs in the several periods, was as follows:—

		Per head.			Per head.
1830 to 1834 . .		\$1.75	1835 to 1841 . .		0.84½
1843 to 1847 . .		1.36	1848-49 . . .		1.—

I exclude here the year 1847-48, because it was an entirely exceptional one. We had imported a large amount of free goods—specie—in the preceding year, and we exported it again in 1847-48, to exchange for duty.

paying ones, and the whole amount of duty received upon the goods so obtained in exchange, should be added to the revenue of 1846-47.

The power to *contribute* towards the revenue certainly decreased in the years of free trade, and precisely as the *necessity* for contributions increased. The amount actually paid was greater than is here set down, because the government collected, between 1834 and 1841, a large amount of duties upon goods received in exchange for certificates of debt; but that was merely a payment in advance of production, and the consequence of receiving such payment was, that it was nearly bankrupt in 1842, and compelled to borrow almost thirty millions to provide for the continuance of its own existence.

We are now doing the same thing. The amount of debt incurred in the last year was not less than twenty-two millions, and upon this the government obtained duties, as before, *in advance of production*, to the extent of almost seven millions. If the power to buy on credit were now to cease, the amount collected would fall to twenty-two millions. Were the debt contracted last year now to be paid, it would fall to fifteen millions, and a large addition would have to be made to the public debt, as in 1841-42. How long a time is to elapse before such will be the state of things, it is not for me to predict; but if we make this year a further addition of twenty millions to our foreign debt, and close as many furnaces as we did in the last one, the day for it cannot be far distant.

The power to contribute towards the maintenance of government depends upon the power of production, and every circumstance tending to diminish the one tends equally to the diminution of the other. The power of production is now rapidly diminishing, and must continue so to do.

Such likewise is the case in England. From year to year the payment of taxes is becoming more and more onerous, notwithstanding so large a portion of them is thrown upon the farmers and planters of the earth, by aid of the system under which they are compelled to give more food, cotton, tobacco, and sugar, for less and less cloth and iron; and yet from year to year the expenditures have been increasing. Poverty produced rebellion in Ireland, and chartism in England, and thus increased the necessity for soldiers and sailors. The exhaustion of the older provinces of India led to a desire for Afghanistan, Scinde, and the Punjaub; and the failure of a market for labour in the form of cotton, drove the Hindoo to opium, which led to a war in China, and thus was made a demand for fleets and armies. The poverty of Canada led to rebellion, and to the building of forts and ships. The anxiety to secure foreign markets has led to immense expenses for steamships and mail steamers, and thus the more the system tends to fail, the greater is the expenditure for its maintenance, and the less the ability of the people of England, and the farmers and planters of the world, to contribute thereto.

Let us now look to the other source of our national revenue—the PUBLIC lands.

The higher the value of labour, the more of it will be brought here for sale. The more people come here, the more land will be required. The larger and more valuable the freights homeward, the less will be the cost of freight outward, and the more numerous will be the commodities that can be exported to pay for those we may choose to import.

Were we now importing a million of men annually, the sales of land would soon reach ten millions of acres per annum. That point we should now reach in five years of perfect and fixed protection, and but few more years would be required to double both the importation of men and the sales of public lands. Here is a vast source of public revenue.

Perfect protection would, by degrees, diminish the import of cottons, iron,



and other duty-paying goods, but we should consume treble or quadruple the quantity of coffee, tea, and the raw materials for the production of which the soil or climate of the country is not suited, and thus should we raise the value of labour employed in agriculture throughout the world.

It is asked, "If we converted all our cotton into cloth, what would Europe produce to pay us for it?" In answer, it may be said that the object of protection is that of enabling the consumer of food to take his place by the side of the producer of food, not to separate them. It is to our interest that the people of England should supply themselves with clothing made by men who eat the food of England, and that such should be the case with those of Germany and Russia, Spain and Italy, and with every step in their progress they would need more cotton. To pay for it, they would employ their labour in the production of thousands of articles of taste and luxury, of which we should then consume immense quantities, and therewith there would be improvement of taste, refinement of feeling, elevation of character, and increase of individual and national strength, of which now we can form no conception.

Upon such commodities the duties would be moderate, and, as the imports of the more bulky of the duty-paying articles diminished, the customs' revenue would gradually decline, until at length the *necessity* for custom-houses would pass away, the *power* to maintain government with the land revenue having grown to take its place, and thus might be realized the wonderful idea of the government of an immense nation maintained without the necessity for a single man employed in the collection of taxes.

It would thus appear that between the interests of the treasury and the people, the farmer, planter, manufacturer, and merchant, the great and little trader and the shipowner, the slave and his master, the landowners and labourers of the Union and the world, the free trader and the advocate of protection, there is perfect harmony of interests, and that the way to the establishment of universal peace and universal free trade, is to be found in the adoption of measures tending to the destruction of *the monopoly of machinery*, and the location of the loom and the anvil in the vicinity of the plough and the harrow.

## CHAPTER TWENTY-SIXTH.

### HOW PROTECTION AFFECTS THE GOVERNMENT.

THE man whose labour is productive, and whose habits are economical, enjoys the confidence of the world; while he whose labour is unproductive, and whose habits are wasteful, is looked upon with distrust. With the one, each day is marked by an increase of strength; while with the other it is marked by an increase of weakness.

So is it with communities. The peaceful and industrious grow rich and strong. The warlike and wasteful become poor and weak.

If protection be "a war upon the labour and capital of the world," it must tend to cause diminution of wealth and strength, and the *monopoly system* of England must tend to the augmentation of both.

At no anterior period had the wealth and strength of this country grown with the rapidity with which it grew from 1830 to 1835. The nation was at peace and all were employed. At no period has decline been so obvious, or the descent more complete than in the period which followed. The nation was at war, and production declined until in many departments of industry it almost ceased. The name of America became almost a by-word for weakness and want of faith. In the four succeeding years, the recovery was such as to be almost marvellous, and then it was that the power of the nation first began to be admitted. That period has been followed by one of war and waste,

and largely increased expenditure, rendering necessary the collection of large revenues, while production is diminishing. The people and the government are now living on borrowed money, and how long they can continue to borrow is uncertain. The revenue from customs in the year ending in June last was . . . . . \$28,436,000

Of which there was collected on goods purchased with certificates of debt . . . . . 6,600,000

To meet the demands of the government for the present year, the whole sum of \$28,000,000 would be required, and, if we should cease to be able to purchase merchandise on credit, the government would be driven again to the raising of money by means of loans, and if at the same time the debts now being created were sent back upon us for payment, the present year might witness a repetition of the troubles of 1841 and 1842.

During the existence of the tariff of 1842, the government paid its way, and therefore it was strong. It is now carried on on credit, and therefore it is becoming weak. To the extent of the foreign debt created, the country has eaten and drunk and used that for which it has yet to pay, and the government has had its thirty per cent.; but a demand for payment would at once reduce the imports as much below the exports as they now exceed them, and the government would find its revenue decreased to the full extent of the present excess.

The contrast presented, on a review of the history of Great Britain and this country, is most instructive. Sixty years since, the former was rich and populous, while the latter was poor and its population was small and widely scattered. In wealth, the Union already exceeds her competitor, and in population it will do so at the close of the next decennial period.

The reason of this is to be found in the fact, that the policy of the one has tended to the separation of the consumer from the producer, while that of the other has, to some extent, tended towards bringing them together. The English system is based upon "ships, colonies, and commerce," and, in carrying it out, her colonies have been in succession exhausted. Ireland now lies prostrate and helpless—a burden upon her hands—an encumbrance rather than an advantage. Poverty and distress are coming gradually nearer and nearer home, while she is encumbered with an enormous debt, no part of which can she pay, and the interest upon which is yet paid only by aid of a series of repudiations quite as discreditable as those with which she is accustomed to charge upon Mississippi and Florida.\*

The American system is based upon agriculture, the work of production, and its object has been that of producing prosperous agriculture, by bringing the consumer to take his place by the side of the producer, and thus establishing that great commerce which is performed without the aid of ships or wagons. By aid of that system the original thirteen States have planted numerous colonies, all of which have grown and thriven, giving and receiving strength, while those of England, so long the subjects of immense taxation, are now everywhere a cause of weakness. All desire to abandon her, while all would desire to unite with us, and were they at liberty to exercise their

---

\* The great expansion of the Bank of England in 1839, was followed by the destruction of confidence among individuals to so great an extent that the three per cents went up to par, and the government availed itself of the opportunity to compel the holders of the four and a half per cents to take in exchange new certificates, bearing three and a half per cent. Shortly after the threes fell to eighty. The last expansion has brought about a similar state of things. Confidence is destroyed, and trade is paralyzed, and the threes are again almost at par; and it is now suggested that a new arrangement may be made by which the government may be enabled to repudiate a further portion of the interest on the debt.

inclinations, the sway of the Queen of Great Britain would, probably, at the close of the present year, be limited to that island alone, with its twenty or twenty-two millions of inhabitants.

The *free trade* of England consists in the maintenance of *monopoly*, and therefore is it repulsive. The protective system of this country looks to the breaking down of monopoly, and the establishment of *perfect free trade*, and therefore is it attractive.

The one looks to "cheap" labour, and therefore does it expel individuals as well as communities. The other looks to raising the value of labour, and therefore does it attract both individuals and communities.

Protection tends to the maintenance of peace, and the increase of wealth and power. The colonial system tends to the production of causes of war, and the diminution and ultimate destruction of both wealth and power.

Between the views of those who would desire to see their government strong for defending them in the enjoyment of all their rights in relation to the other communities of the world, and those of others who desire to see the government peacefully and economically administered, there is therefore perfect harmony.

## CHAPTER TWENTY-SEVENTH.

### HOW PROTECTION AFFECTS THE NATION.

THE man whose labour is productive, exercises the power of self-government, which increases with every increase in the productiveness of his labour. With every diminution in his power of production, he loses more and more the power of self-government, and ultimately becomes a slave.\*

So is it with nations. With every increase in the productiveness of their labour, they are more enabled to determine for themselves their own course of action, uninfluenced by that of surrounding nations. With every diminution therein, they are more and more compelled to shape their course of action by that of others, losing the power of self-government.

With the diminished *necessity* for combination with their neighbours, there is an increased *power* for voluntary combination, (annexation,) tending still further to increase the return to labour. With increased *necessity* for combination, there is diminished *power* for voluntary combination, with diminished return to labour.

If protection be "a war upon labour and capital," it must diminish the power of voluntary union, and increase the necessity for uniting our efforts with those of distant nations. If the English monopoly system tend to increase the value of labour and capital, it must tend to increase the power of voluntary union, and diminish the necessity for involuntary union.

Of all the nations of the world, there is, at the present time, not one that exercises in a less degree the power of self-government than that of Great Britain. For the last thirty years, her policy has been dictated by others. The repeal of the laws prohibiting the export of machinery was a matter of necessity, and so have been, in succession, all the laws relative to duties on imports. The duty on cotton was abolished because other nations had obtained machinery. Slave-grown cotton was admitted duty free, while slave-grown sugar was subjected to heavy duties, because a supply of cotton was

---

\* "The transition from absolute freedom to a state of slavery is now in progress among the Arabs of Mesopotamia, owing to diminished power of obtaining the means of subsistence by the modes heretofore pursued. The poor and the weak are enslaved by those who are stronger and more wealthy."—*Spectator*, March, 1840.



matter of necessity. The restrictions on slave-grown sugar were abandoned, because the abandonment was necessary. The navigation laws have, step by step, been abandoned, as matter of necessity. The corn laws were repealed because it was deemed necessary to conciliate the growers of corn into becoming large purchasers of cloth and iron. With each step in her progress, pauperism and crime increase, and the necessity for places of banishment for criminals increases, and with each there is increased difficulty in finding places willing to receive them. Having exhausted Van Diemen's land,\* and Norfolk Island, the Cape was recently selected for the purpose, but the colonists have set an example of successful resistance that will be elsewhere followed. Canada is now to be set free, and Ireland is to be retained, neither of them of choice, but both as matters of necessity. The nation has lost the power of self-government. Its policy is being dictated to it by the other nations of the world. The tendency to voluntary union has ceased to exist, and each day brings with it new evidence that the dissolution of the British empire is at hand.

If such is the case with the owners of the loom and the anvil, how is it with their subjects who hold the plough and follow the harrow? Ireland has no power of self-government. She is a mere machine in the hands of those who perform the duties of government. Poor-laws are inflicted upon her to such an extent as almost to amount to a confiscation of property, and then other laws are passed to authorize commissioners to take possession of, and sell, a large portion of the property of the kingdom, thus encumbered.

The West Indies were gradually exhausted under the system, and their people despoiled of their property by virtue of laws passed by men who paid no portion of the enormous loss thus inflicted upon their fellow-subjects. The people of Canada have had new systems inflicted upon them with a view to the maintenance of peace, but peace there is none. All desire to obtain the right of self-government, the first step in which will be resistance to the monopoly system.

Of all the colonies of England, the only one that has prospered is this Union, and it has so done, because it has, in a certain degree, exercised the power of self-government, manifested by a determination to bring the loom and the anvil to take their natural places by the side of the plough and the harrow. Hence it is that every colony of Great Britain, Ireland included, desires annexation to us and separation from her. The tendency to voluntary union exists in a degree exceeding any thing that the world has yet seen. Nevertheless, we are yet but little more than a colony. Our people have no control over their own actions. They are almost as dependent upon the will of those who now desire, though vainly, to guide the movements of England, as are those of Canada.

If the people of that country determine to make railroads, iron rises in price, and we build furnaces and open coal mines, and import people to make iron and mine coal. If they cease to make roads, we shut up our furnaces

---

\* "Thither nearly the whole convict population of Great Britain and Ireland, about 3500 annually in number, were sent for several years. \* \* The consequence was, that ere long *three-fifths* of the inhabitants of the colony were convicts. \* \* The morals of the settlement, thus having a majority of convicts, were essentially injured. Crimes unutterable were committed; the hideous inequality of the sexes induced its usual and frightful disorders; the police, how severe and vigilant soever, became unable to coerce the rapidly increasing multitude of criminals; the most daring fled to the woods, where they became bush-rangers; life became insecure, and property sank to half its former value."—*Blackwood's Magazine*, November, 1819. "At present, there are, or at least should be, above 5000 criminals annually transported from the British Islands."—*Ibid*.

and mines, and then the iron men and the coal men have to endeavour to raise food. If they ask a high price for cloth, we build mills. If employment become scarce with them, and their people cease to consume cloth, we close our mills, and our operatives are condemned to idleness. If the Bank of England make money cheap, we buy iron and cloth on credit; if it make it dear, we are called upon for payment, and then we break. If employment for capital be denied at home, our houses and lands rise in price; if capital become scarce, our houses and lands fall in value. If we build mills and furnaces, our people stay at home; if we close them, they scatter abroad. If money be cheap in England, our government obtains a large revenue from duties on the goods that are bought on credit; if it be dear, the revenue falls off, and the government begs for loans in Europe. The value of every thing, and the movement of every thing, in this country, are settled by the movement of the Bank of England, of all the large institutions of the world the one in the government of which there is manifested the least capacity; and the one, consequently, that possesses in the smallest degree the power of self-government. Four times in thirty years has it been on the verge of bankruptcy, and yet to its ear and that of the government of England, now floundering in a sea of troubles, is this Union attached by aid of the system now known by the name of free trade.

For thus relinquishing the power of self-government, there should be a large consideration; yet all that we receive from Europe in return for all we send her is fifty cents' worth of iron, half a pound of wool, as much flax, an ounce or two of silk, a cup and saucer, and the weaving and twisting of a pound and a half of cotton, per head, all of which could be produced or performed here by fewer people than have come here in a single year, when we have made a market for their labour. Half a million of people would produce treble the flax, the wool, the silk, and the iron, the china-ware, and spin and weave treble the quantity of silk, wool, flax, and cotton, that we receive from Europe in return for all the land and labour employed in producing the cotton, tobacco, rice, grain, butter, cheese, pork, and other commodities that we send to that quarter of the world; and that half million would consume almost as much cotton as is now consumed by all the people of Ireland, besides being customers to the farmer for fifty millions of dollars' worth of food, timber, and other of the products of the soil. We thus relinquish the power of self-government, not only without receiving an equivalent, but we give our property without an equivalent, and therefore it is that the farmers and planters of the Union remain poor when they might become rich.

Rich they would grow, for the people thus imported would require a vast amount of shipping, and cotton, rice, and tobacco would go cheaply abroad, while a vast consumption at home would maintain the price, and both farmer and planter would be enabled to consume more largely of coffee, tea, silks, books, pictures, gold, silver, and all other articles of necessity or luxury not produced at home, and the producers of those commodities would consume more cloth and iron, both of which we should then produce so cheaply that we could send them abroad, and thus would come wealth and prosperity, happiness and independence.

To the consciousness of the necessity for protection against the monopoly system was due the state of feeling that led to the Revolution. Resistance to oppression led, on various occasions, to non-importation resolutions, and the people were everywhere urged to endeavour to clothe themselves. The necessity for protection was recognised by the early Congresses, and its importance urged upon them by every administration.

Fifty years since, power changed hands; but with the accession of Mr.



Jefferson came no change of policy. He thought "the manufacturer should take his place by the side of the agriculturist." From that time, for a period of thirty-six years, every chief magistrate, *elected by the people*, was from the planting States of the Union, and all of them elected by the same party that elected Mr. Jefferson, and each and every one of them was an advocate of the system which tended to bring the loom to the neighbourhood of the plough, and thus to make a market on the land for the products of the land. By the last of these, his views on this subject were forcibly expressed in a letter that has frequently been published, and from which the following is an extract :

"I will ask, what is the real situation of the agriculturist? Where has the American farmer a market for his surplus produce? Except for cotton, he has neither a foreign nor home market. Does not this clearly prove, when there is no market either at home or abroad, that there is too much labour employed in agriculture, and that the *channels for labour should be multiplied*? Common sense points out at once the remedy; draw from agriculture this superabundant labour, employ it in mechanism and manufactures, thereby creating a home market for your breadstuffs, and distributing labour to the most profitable account, and benefits to the country will result. Take from agriculture in the United States six hundred thousand men, women, and children, and you will at once give a home market for more breadstuffs than all Europe now furnishes us. In short, sir, we have been too long subject to the policy of British merchants. It is true that we should become a little more Americanized, and, instead of feeding the paupers and labourers of England, [as we do by sending there for her manufactures,] feed our own; or else, in a short time, by continuing our present [free trade] policy, we shall all be rendered paupers ourselves."—*President Jackson*.

At the close of that period there was a change of policy. Elected by the same party that had elected his predecessor, Mr. Van Buren adopted the policy which tends to the separation of the consumer from the producer, to the impoverishment of the land and its owner, and the maintenance of the monopoly system by which England had acquired the control of the movements of the world. The effects were disastrous, as may be seen by all who study the diagrams given in the third chapter, and the consequence was a political revolution. For the first time in forty years, a president was elected by the people not being of the party generally known as that of the Democrats. Democracy had changed sides, and the people did not go with it. The consequence of this was, nearly two years later, a return to the policy of protection and a restoration of prosperity, and with prosperity the party that had so long controlled the movements of the country was again restored to power. Unwilling, however, to acknowledge that the revolution of 1840 had been the consequence of an error of policy, they ascribed it to various minor and insignificant causes, and proceeded to the enactment of the tariff of 1846, and the consequence was another revolution by which the party of protection was again restored to power. Like the former, that revolution is now ascribed to minor causes; but those who will study the diagrams to which I have above referred can scarcely fail to see that it was due to the fact that the party styled Democratic had espoused a course of policy that tended to diminish the value of labour, to degrade the labourer, to depress the democracy at home, and to maintain the aristocracy abroad; nor can they, as I think, fail to arrive at the belief that no party adverse to protection can again hold power in this country. Such being the case, the interest of both parties, if actuated solely by purely selfish considerations, would lead to the advocacy of the same course of policy—the one in power desiring that it might not be adopted, and that thus they might profit by the agitation of the question for maintaining themselves in authority, and the one out of power, that it might be settled, and the agitation of the question brought to a close.



## CONCLUSION.

MUCH is said of "the mission" of the people of these United States, and most of it is said by persons who appear to limit themselves to the consideration of the *powers* of the nation, and rarely to think of its *duties*. By such men the grandeur of the national position is held to be greatly increased by having expended sixty or eighty millions upon a war with a weak neighbour, and having thus acquired the power to purchase, at a high price, a vast body of wild land that would, in the natural course of events, have been brought within the Union, in reasonable time, without the cost of a dollar or a life. By such men, the fitting out of expeditions for the purpose of producing civil war among our neighbours of Cuba, is held to be another evidence of grandeur. Others would have us to mix ourselves up with all the revolutionists of Europe; while a fourth and last set sigh at the reflection that our fleets and armies are too small for the magnificence of our position.

By some it is supposed that our "mission" is that of monopolizing the commerce of the world, and the time is anxiously looked for when we shall have "diplomatic relations" with "vast regions of the East," Persia, Corea, Cochin-China, Burmah and Japan, with whom "nothing but the steam-ship can successfully introduce our commerce." By "persevering and successful efforts," it is thought we may secure the "commerce of Japan." That done,

"New York," it is thought, "would become the *dépôt* and storehouse and entrepôts of the world, the centre of business and exchanges, the clearing house of international trade and business, the place where assorted cargoes of our own products and manufactures, as well as those of all foreign countries, would be sold and reshipped, and the point to which specie and bullion would flow, as the great creditor city of the world for the adjustment of balances, as the factor of all nations and the point whence this specie would flow into the interior of our country through all the great channels of international trade and intercourse. With these great events accomplished, and with abundant facilities for the warehousing of foreign and domestic goods at New York, it must eventually surpass in wealth, in commerce, and population, any European emporium, whilst, as a necessary consequence, all our other cities and every portion of the Union and all our great interests, would derive corresponding advantages."—*Treasury Report, December, 1848.*

The cost of a mission to Japan would build half a dozen furnaces that would add more to the wealth of the nation in five years than the commerce of that country would do in half a century. The amount we have expended on the mission to Austria, in search of a market for tobacco, would bring here as many Germans as would consume almost as much of our tobacco as is now consumed in the empire, and those tobacco consumers would do more for the growth of New York than either Japan or Austria.

The English doctrine of "ships, colonies, and commerce" is thus reproduced on this side of the Atlantic, and its adoption by the nation would be followed by effects similar to those which have been already described as existing in England. There, for a time, it gave the power to tax the world for the maintenance of fleets and armies, as had before been done by Athens and by Rome, and there it is now producing the same results that have elsewhere resulted from the same system, poverty, depopulation, exhaustion, and weakness.

But little study of our history is required to satisfy the inquirer that the power of the Union, and its magnificent position among the nations of the earth, are due to the fact that we have to so great an extent abstained from measures requiring the maintenance of fleets and armies. The consequence has been that taxes have been light, capital has accumulated rapidly, labour

has been productive, and the labourer has received wages that have enabled him to feed, clothe, and educate his children, and the nation has thus performed its true "mission" in elevating the condition of man. If we desire to find exceptions to this, we must look to those periods in which the policy of Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, and Jackson, was departed from, and when the government adopted measures tending to the maintenance of the English monopoly of machinery, and there we shall find taxes more heavy, capital accumulating more slowly, labour more unproductive, and the wages of labour so much depressed that the labourer finds it difficult to feed or clothe his children, and still more difficult to educate them.

Two systems are before the world; the one looks to increasing the proportion of persons and of capital engaged in trade and transportation, and therefore to diminishing the proportion engaged in producing commodities with which to trade, with *necessarily* diminished return to the labour of all; while the other looks to increasing the proportion engaged in the work of production, and diminishing that engaged in trade and transportation, with increased return to all, giving to the labourer good wages, and to the owner of capital good profits. One looks to increasing the quantity of raw materials to be exported, and diminishing the inducements to the import of men, thus impoverishing both farmer and planter by throwing on them the burden of freight; while the other looks to increasing the import of men, and diminishing the export of raw materials, thereby enriching both planter and farmer by relieving them from the payment of freight. One looks to giving the *products* of millions of acres of land and of the labour of millions of men for the *services* of hundreds of thousands of distant men; the other to bringing the distant men to consume on the land the products of the land, exchanging day's labour for day's labour. One looks to compelling the farmers and planters of the Union to continue their contributions for the support of the fleets and the armies, the paupers, the nobles, and the sovereigns of Europe; the other to enabling ourselves to apply the same means to the moral and intellectual improvement of the sovereigns of America.\* One looks to the continuance of that *bastard* freedom of trade which denies the principle of protection, yet doles it out as revenue duties; the other to extending the area of *legitimate* free trade by the establishment of perfect protection, followed by the annexation of individuals and communities, and ultimately by the abolition of custom-houses. One looks to exporting men to occupy desert tracts, the sovereignty of which is obtained by aid of diplomacy or war; the other to increasing the value of an immense extent of vacant land by importing men by millions for their occupation. One looks to the *centralization* of wealth and power in a great commercial city that shall rival the great cities of modern times, which have been and are being supported by aid of contributions which have exhausted every nation subjected to them; the other to *concentration*, by aid of which a market shall be made upon the land for the products of the land, and the farmer and planter be enriched. One looks to increasing the necessity for commerce; the other to increasing the power to maintain it. One looks to underworking the Hindoo, and sinking the rest of the world to his level; the other to raising the standard of man throughout the world to our level. One looks to pauperism, ignorance, depopulation, and barbarism; the other to increasing wealth, comfort, intelligence, combination of action, and civilization. One looks towards universal war; the other towards universal peace. One is the English system; the other we

---

\* Russia is now raising by loan five millions of pounds sterling to pay the expenses of the war in Hungary. The farmers and planters of the Union are the chief contributors to this loan

may be proud to call the American system, for it is the only one ever devised the tendency of which was that of ELEVATING while EQUALIZING the condition of man throughout the world.

SUCH is the true MISSION of the people of these United States. To them has been granted a privilege never before granted to man, that of the exercise of the right of perfect self-government; but, as rights and duties are inseparable, with the grant of the former came the obligation to perform the latter. Happily their performance is pleasant and profitable, and involves no sacrifice. To raise the value of labour throughout the world, we need only to raise the value of our own. To raise the value of land throughout the world, it is needed only that we adopt measures that shall raise the value of our own. To diffuse intelligence and to promote the cause of morality throughout the world, we are required only to pursue the course that shall diffuse education throughout our own land, and shall enable every man more readily to acquire property, and with it respect for the rights of property. To improve the political condition of man throughout the world, it is needed that we ourselves should remain at peace, avoid taxation for the maintenance of fleets and armies, and become rich and prosperous. To raise the condition of woman throughout the world, it is required of us only that we pursue that course that enables men to remain at home and marry, that they may surround themselves with happy children and grand-children. To substitute true Christianity for the detestable system known as the Malthusian, it is needed that we prove to the world that it is population that makes the food come from the rich soils, and that food tends to increase more rapidly than population, thus vindicating the policy of God to man. Doing these things, the addition to our population by immigration will speedily rise to millions, and with each and every year the desire for that perfect freedom of trade which results from incorporation within the Union, will be seen to spread and to increase in its intensity, leading gradually to the establishment of an empire the most extensive and magnificent the world has yet seen, based upon the principles of maintaining peace itself, and strong enough to insist upon the maintenance of peace by others, yet carried on without the aid of fleets, or armies, or taxes, the sales of public lands alone sufficing to pay the expenses of government.

To establish such an empire—to prove that among the people of the world, whether agriculturists, manufacturers, or merchants, there is perfect harmony of interests, and that the happiness of individuals, as well as the grandeur of nations, is to be promoted by perfect obedience to that greatest of all commands, “Do unto others as ye would that others should do unto you,”—is the object and will be the result of that mission. Whether that result shall be speedily attained, or whether it shall be postponed to a distant period, will depend greatly upon the men who are charged with the performance of the duties of government. If their movements be governed by that enlightened self-interest which induces man to seek his happiness in the promotion of that of his fellow-man, it will come soon. If, on the contrary, they be governed by that ignorant selfishness which leads to the belief that individuals, party, or national interests, are to be promoted by measures tending to the deterioration of the condition of others, it will be late.



INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY  
CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

# THE PROSPECT:

AGRICULTURAL, MANUFACTURING, COMMERCIAL, AND FINANCIAL:

AT THE OPENING OF THE YEAR 1851.

BY

HENRY C. CAREY.

Published and for sale by J. S. SKINNER, 79 Walnut St., Philadelphia.  
8vo.—Price 25 cents.

---

By the same Author.

## PRINCIPLES OF POLITICAL ECONOMY.

In three volumes, 8vo.

---

## THE PAST, THE PRESENT, AND THE FUTURE.

In one vol. 8vo.

“Full of valuable information.”—*Economist*.

“Decidedly a book to be read by all who take an interest in the progress of social science.”—*Athenæum*.

“It sheds a flood of light upon some of the most difficult, most perplexing theorems of the economical science; establishes, as we conceive, some general principles of the highest value, and withal invests the subject with an interest and attraction scarcely to be imagined by those who have studied only the hard elaborations of Ricardo, Mill, McCulloch, and other economists.”—*Commercial Advertiser*.

“A volume of extensive information, deep thought, high intelligence, and, moreover, of material utility.”—*London Morning Advertiser*.

“It need not be supposed that a work of economical instruction is necessarily dry because it is methodical. We know few books more entertaining than ‘The Past, the Present and the Future.’ A young lady might read it, without suspicion that she was becoming indoctrinated in any thing serious enough to be called scientific, and would probably be greatly surprised to discover that she knew more of political economy than is to be found in the arm-chair of most professors.”—*American Whig Review*.

# THE TREATY

OF THE  
TREATY OF 1842  
AND  
TREATY OF 1843

THE TREATY OF 1842  
AND  
TREATY OF 1843



























